

**THE TEXT IS FLY  
WITHIN THE BOOK  
ONLY**

**This book is with  
tight  
Binding**





070.4 065

Gobb of "The World"

Stack No.

125412

070.4

065

### Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



**Public Library**  
**Kansas City, Mo.**

**Keep Your Card in This Pocket**

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

KANSAS CITY MO PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0258659 1







*Frank J. Cobb.*

COBB OF "THE WORLD"



# COBB OF "THE WORLD"

*A Leader in Liberalism*

COMPILED FROM HIS EDITORIAL ARTICLES  
AND PUBLIC ADDRESSES

BY  
JOHN L. HEATON



NEW YORK  
E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY  
681 FIFTH AVENUE



Copyright, 1924,  
By THE PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY

---

*All rights reserved*

## FOREWORD

I HAVE known no man whose sturdiness of character and clear vision of duty impressed me more than those of Frank I. Cobb. He completely won my confidence and affection and I recognized in him a peculiar genius for giving direct and effective expression to the enlightened opinions which he held. I consider his death an irreparable loss to journalism and to the liberal political policies which are necessary to liberate mankind from the errors of the past and the partisan selfishness of the present. His death leaves a vacancy in the ranks of liberal thinkers which some one should press forward to fill if the impulse of progress is not to be stayed.

WOODROW WILSON.

## NOTE

Except when otherwise stated, each article in this book is quoted from the Editorial Page of the New York *World* for the date given beneath the title.

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD . . . . .	Woodrow Wilson v
COBB, THE MAN . . . . .	Lindsay Denison xi
A PERSONAL TRIBUTE . . . . .	Ralph Pulitzer xxvii

## CHAPTER I. PANAMA

The Panama Scandal—Let Congress Investigate . . . . .	2
Lese-Majesty . . . . .	8
A Political Persecution . . . . .	12
Plain Facts about a Political Persecution . . . . .	16
A History-Making Case . . . . .	17
Law Versus Lawlessness—Liberty Versus Lese-Majesty . . . . .	21
A Crook and a Jackass . . . . .	23
A Question of Honor . . . . .	25
The Nation's Pledge . . . . .	27
A Vindication . . . . .	32

## CHAPTER II. THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. Roosevelt's Greatest Triumph . . . . .	36
More Muddling of Government . . . . .	39
For Senator—Roosevelt! . . . . .	45
Mr. Roosevelt's Return . . . . .	48
Roosevelt and the Third-Term Tradition . . . . .	55
A Charter of Demagogy . . . . .	57
"To The Y. M. C. A." . . . . .	61
Theodore Roosevelt . . . . .	63

## CHAPTER III. THE CHANGING SCENE

Abolishing the States . . . . .	67
True Democracy . . . . .	70
The Twilight of the Gods—1 . . . . .	74
The Twilight of the Gods—2 . . . . .	77
A New Democratic Party . . . . .	79
Democracy—or Despotism . . . . .	80
A Charter of Invisible Government . . . . .	91
The Overshadowing President . . . . .	92

	PAGE
Have the States Abdicated? . . . . .	95
Abolish the Electoral College . . . . .	96
In Memoriam . . . . .	98
Then and Now . . . . .	102
A Revolution . . . . .	104
A Twentieth Amendment . . . . .	107
A Break-Down of Government . . . . .	109
Is Our Democracy Stagnant? . . . . .	112
 CHAPTER IV. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN	
Mr. Bryan's Blind Pool . . . . .	124
Twelve Years of Bryanism . . . . .	129
Bryan's Nomination Meant Taft's Election . . . . .	133
 CHAPTER V. WILLIAM J. GAYNOR	
Judge Gaynor's Independence . . . . .	136
A Victim of Duty . . . . .	137
William J. Gaynor . . . . .	140
 CHAPTER VI. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES	
Yes or No? . . . . .	144
From Tilden to Hughes . . . . .	145
Gov. Hughes and the Income Tax . . . . .	148
An Admirable Appointment . . . . .	151
Mr. Hughes for Chief Justice . . . . .	153
Why it is Roosevelt . . . . .	155
 CHAPTER VII. THE MONEY POWER	
One-Man Power . . . . .	159
J. Pierpont Morgan . . . . .	163
A Chapter of Financial Infamy . . . . .	166
The End of a Myth . . . . .	168
New Haven Corruption . . . . .	171
A Time to Act . . . . .	175
 CHAPTER VIII. WOODROW WILSON	
For President—Woodrow Wilson! . . . . .	178
Wilson—No Compromise with Ryan and Murphy! . . . . .	183
A New Birth of Freedom . . . . .	185
A Speech that Will Live . . . . .	187
A New Democracy on Trial . . . . .	191
A New American Doctrine . . . . .	196
A Year of Wilson . . . . .	199

# CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
Wilson and Roosevelt . . . . .	201
Woodrow Wilson . . . . .	206
Mr. Wilson Vetoes a Lie . . . . .	209
No Third Term . . . . .	210
Woodrow Wilson—An Interpretation . . . . .	212
CHAPTER IX. ALFRED E. SMITH	
Saved from Eternal Disgrace . . . . .	231
Nullifying the Election. . . . .	233
A Government that Can't Work. . . . .	235
CHAPTER X. THE PROFESSION OF JOURNALISM	
Are Newspapers Declining in Influence? . . . . .	238
Mr. Pulitzer's Journalism . . . . .	239
Thirty Years—A Retrospect . . . . .	244
Sedition! . . . . .	247
CHAPTER XI. THE WAR	
An Indictment of Civilization . . . . .	250
Autocracy or Democracy . . . . .	251
We Also . . . . .	254
Will Congress Haul Down the Flag? . . . . .	255
"Peace Without Victory" . . . . .	258
What the President Proposes . . . . .	260
1796 or 1917? . . . . .	263
Without Fear and Without Reproach . . . . .	265
On the Eve of War . . . . .	267
Downfall . . . . .	270
Seeds of New Wars . . . . .	273
Peace or Anarchy . . . . .	275
Ludendorff's Story . . . . .	277
Economic Aspects of Disarmament . . . . .	280
CHAPTER XII. THE CONDUCT OF LIFE	
The Plays of Bernard Shaw . . . . .	288
Robert E. Lee . . . . .	293
Ed Howe . . . . .	295
R. I. P. . . . .	296
The Annexation Bogy . . . . .	297
The Los Angeles Murder Trial . . . . .	299
Our Treaties with Russia . . . . .	300
Perverted Sympathy . . . . .	302
Woman's Right to Vote . . . . .	304

	PAGE
Appomattox Fifty Years After . . . . .	310
A Contemptible Legislature . . . . .	311
A Do-Nothing Congress . . . . .	313
The Law of the Land . . . . .	314
Oklahoma's Civil War . . . . .	317
Government by Minorities . . . . .	319
The Forgotten Man . . . . .	321
 CHAPTER XIII. PUBLIC OPINION	
Freedom of Speech in War . . . . .	324
Too Much Censorship . . . . .	327
Public Opinion . . . . .	329
Government by Hysteria . . . . .	344
A Despotism of Politicians . . . . .	346
A Legislative Lynching . . . . .	348
Free Speech—Its Value and its Perils . . . . .	350
 CHAPTER XIV. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS	
The Cornerstone of Peace . . . . .	363
Senate Usurpation . . . . .	365
As it Was in the Beginning . . . . .	368
Lodge Versus Lodge . . . . .	374
Only its Debts and its Dead . . . . .	377
Armistice Day . . . . .	379
Democracy in Foreign Affairs . . . . .	381
Decorated but Deserted . . . . .	383
The Limitation of Armament . . . . .	385
Lord Robert Cecil's Mission . . . . .	389
 CHAPTER XV. THE LAST ARTICLE	
President Coolidge . . . . .	393
 CHAPTER XVI. "THE WORLD'S" TRIBUTE . . . . .	395

## COBB, THE MAN

By

LINDSAY DENISON

THE last words dictated by Woodrow Wilson were those telling of his regard for Frank Cobb, which preface this volume. Henry Watterson, giving the history of his own rich life in newspaper making, wrote: "Frank Irving Cobb, is, as I have often said, the strongest writer of the New York press since Horace Greeley. But he can hardly be called a sentimentalist as Greeley was. . . ."

What Frank Cobb got out of life he earned. He had no favors of fortune save his own brave, clean, hard-working soul. Because he was not vain, never given to talk of himself, the data of his life which can be set down are scanty. Such facts as are here found are all which could be gathered by his friend and daily fellow worker, John L. Heaton.

Frank Irving Cobb was born in Shannon County, Kansas, August 6, 1869. In his early boyhood, as his friend George L. Rockwell remembers, "the buffalo herds still roamed the Western plains; there was still the overland stage coach with its four- and six-horse teams carrying only the mails, passengers and light baggage, while ten- and twelve-ox and mule teams pulled the burdens of heavy freight. The Arapahoes, Cheyennes and Sioux were on the warpath; the Younger brothers, Dalton boys and Jesse James gang were engaged in their nefarious raids;



and last but not least among these primitive methods and hardships to be endured was the devastating pest, the grasshopper, devouring everything to the starvation of humanity. The Black Hills gold excitement and the Custer Massacre were his boyhood recollections as neighboring events.

Driven from Kansas by the grasshoppers, Minor H. Cobb, who had moved from a New York farm after the Civil War, took his son to the lumber woods region of Michigan. There, too, Cobb grew in a rough country among rough men. His formal education was gained in the public schools and the Michigan State Normal School. Such brief and elementary training as this opportunity afforded him was supplemented by experience and observation as a working boy in lumber camps and sawmill yards near his home. It was extended and completed by travel, by association with keen minds in this and other lands, and especially by eager and ceaseless study.

So, in this typically American career, a splendid physique hardened by toil in the open air sustained in its labors a mind unusually keen and quick and enabled it to draw information from every source and use it with power and self-confidence. Throughout his busy life Cobb was a scholar, wide-ranging in his interests, a linguist, philosopher, scientist—so far as an amateur can be that—political economist, historian and above all a tireless champion of political liberalism and human freedom. In this respect he lived and labored in the great tradition of the champions of progress in the English-speaking world.

Martin, Michigan, remembers him as the boyish superintendent of its high school in 1890. His friends might have expected him to follow the path trodden by so many American youth, teaching school while pursuing those legal studies for which his mind was so well attuned; but it was equally in line with tradition that by happy accident he should have been drafted into journalism.

His first vote nearly coincided with his beginning newspaper work as a reporter on the Grand Rapids *Herald*, of which he became political correspondent and city editor. At twenty-four he shifted to the Grand Rapids *Eagle* as city editor; at twenty-five to the Detroit *Evening News* as political correspondent again. At twenty-seven he was editorial writer on the same newspaper, and he was barely past thirty when he became leading editorial writer of the Detroit *Free Press*, where he remained four years. His newspaper experience in Michigan, not fifteen years all told, was more varied and educative than would have been possible in the metropolitan field. He "covered" several sessions of the Michigan Legislature, some of them scandalous and all of them lively. He reported three national conventions of both great political parties, gaining a wide acquaintance with party leaders from every State, none of whom ever forgot the eager, impetuous, stalwart young man whose judgments were so mature despite his enthusiasms and his impulsiveness; whose strong features commanded attention, whose eyes reflected sympathy, merriment, kindliness and an unfailing interest in men of every sort.

Michigan itself had its share of men with the bark on in those formative days. Henry Ford was known to the editor as a struggling young mechanic. Charles L. Freer was forming the matchless art collection he has since given to the Nation. Hazen Pingree, as Mayor of Detroit and Governor of Michigan, a whimsical patriot, was achieving national reputation; he relied much upon young Cobb's judgment. Julius Caesar Burrows and James McMillan were Senators. Strong characters like Chase Osborn and William A. Smith and "Joe" Fordney were coming forward. Such men chiefly appealed to the young journalist because they meant power or the promise of it; but his strength was great enough, his adaptiveness sufficiently all-embracing, to draw within his circle of acquaint-

ances players, singers and other artists, in whose work and ways he remained to the end deeply interested.

Newspaper work is expression as well as impression. While Cobb was absorbing the varied culture for which he became remarkable, he was daily putting forth editorial comment of a kind to compel wide attention. Probably at that time he thought little of a wider field than Detroit, but in a wider field he was becoming known.

*The World*, acquired in 1883 by Joseph Pulitzer, had from the first been more than a newspaper; its proprietor's chief interest in its conduct was to make it a power in moulding and reflecting liberal public opinion. At first Mr. Pulitzer was his own editor. Then his failing sight compelled him to make use of other eyes and other pens. In 1904 his chief editorial writer was, as he had been for twelve years, the dearly beloved William Henry Merrill, whose strength was failing and whose remaining years were to be few. Connected with the editorial staff there were, or there had been recently, a remarkable group of men, all of whom are now gone. George Cary Eggleston, David Graham Phillips, James W. Clarke, Samuel E. Moffett and John A. Dillon, two of whom were later to die untimely and in tragic ways, were leaving the staff, or had left it, or were soon to leave; within a few years it was to be entirely reconstructed. In that process, already seen as necessary, though the rapidity and completeness of the change could not be foreseen, a strong man was needed to be Mr. Merrill's right hand and later to succeed him. Cobb was chosen for that post after an intensive study of the American newspaper field. The witticism was common in the profession that Mr. Pulitzer's cowboys had cut out, roped and branded the young Detroit editor, after ascertaining that he was sound of wind and limb and just about the age Mr. Pulitzer himself had been when he assumed charge of *The World*.

The jest was not far from the truth. Samuel M.

Williams of Mr. Pulitzer's staff had been set to the task of finding a man who would disprove his employer's petulant epigram. "Every reporter is a hope; every editor is a disappointment."

Mr. Williams drifted across the United States reading the editorial pages of newspapers in each place which he visited. In Detroit, reading the *Free Press*, he knew he was on the way to fulfill his mission. He marked a series of editorials printed in two weeks' time as the work of a man of the type he was seeking. He learned that Frank Cobb had written them; he found a friend who brought him together with Cobb at dinner. Without giving any inkling of his purpose Mr. Williams tried to make Cobb talk about himself—and failed, of course, except as the young editor talked of his ideals of editorial work. On the report of Mr. Williams, who carried his search no further, Mr. Pulitzer asked Cobb to come to New York.

"Cobb will do," Mr. Pulitzer—who would not have been his exacting self if he had acknowledged himself satisfied—told his messenger afterwards. "He will do. He knows American history better than any man I have found. He has the damnable Roosevelt obsession; he must learn to be brief. But I think we can make a real editor of him, in time."

That was in 1904. For nearly twenty years Cobb was in close connection with *The World's* editorial page and, after a brief period of preparation in frequent conference with Joseph Pulitzer, he was almost constantly in charge of it, though the title of editor did not pass so long as Mr. Pulitzer lived.

It would be idle to remark that it was a period that made history. It included *The World's* great campaign against corruption in the insurance world, in which the political fortunes of Charles E. Hughes were so deeply involved; the local Administration in New York of

Mayors McClellan, Gaynor, Mitchel and Hylan; the Taft campaign of 1908 and the Roosevelt schism of the Progressives; the Panama libel suit brought against *The World*, the Indianapolis *News* and certain of their editors by the direct order of President Roosevelt—in which, by the way, all honors remained with the defendants—and the opportunity, with the need, of sharp comment upon many phases of political waste, corruption, incompetency and hypocrisy. In such fights Cobb was ever in the forefront.

Incomparably the most weighty burden those crowded years piled upon his shoulders was, of course, bestowed by the World War. In this crisis he was a wise adviser, opposed to a premature entering into the struggle when American public sentiment would not have sanctioned such a course, but when once we were engaged, strongly championing the American cause and as strongly pleading, when the fighting ceased, for an intelligent study of terms upon which real peace could be expected. In this course, marked out for him and for *The World* by manifest necessity, he was brought into such prominence as a supporter of the Wilson policies, as embodied in the Fourteen Points, and in domestic reforms, as to cause much ignorant, and some ill-natured, comment upon *The World* as "Mr. Wilson's Organ."

Of course *The World* was not, and never had been, any man's organ. It had energetically disclaimed that assumption in the case of Mr. Cleveland and when he issued his famous Venezuela message it had led, in a memorable burst of energized advocacy, the international movement to reprove and to defeat urgings toward war with Great Britain which were by no means to be ignored. It had supported for office, and in office, men without regard to party lines, and certainly without regard to the personal fortunes of individual statesmen. So when, in

October, 1918, Cobb was briefly drafted into the national service, unofficially, as a member of the House Commission at the Armistice Conference, and in the preliminaries of the peace discussion, he ceased for the time being all connection with *The World*.

In fact, Cobb's relations with the great War President were only those ideal ones of frank friendship unhampered by official connection which made plain speech possible, and he was for this reason, as well as for his greater experience in national politics, one of Mr. Wilson's trusted advisers. Where *The World* differed from Wilson its columns never hesitated to make plain the fact, as when it criticised the retention of Burleson as Postmaster General and sharply challenged the President's great blunder, in the campaign of 1918, in calling for the election of a Democratic Congress to sustain his after-war policies and make continued co-operation possible between Congress and the Executive.

The technique Cobb devoted to his great life work was of a high order. With him editorship did not consist merely of inspiring, directing and at need restraining the labors of others, though he did that well, and it is important. He was a powerful editorial writer in his own right. It is a calling that derives straight from Cobbett and Peter Zenger, from Tom Paine and Franklin and Alexander Hamilton, from Defoe and Milton further back; the essentials of the art have not changed by the shifting of its scene from the pamphlet to the daily newspaper. Of a little group of known and distinguished contemporaries—headed, as dean, by the late Col. Wattersont and including William Allen White, the late Dr. McKelway of Brooklyn, E. P. Mitchell of the old *Sun*, the late Charles R. Miller and others—he was an acknowledged member, and most of the leaders of that profession he knew personally and intimately. By newspaper men, at

least, Col. Watterson's jest at Cobb about boring a hole in *The World's* gilt dome to "let the darkness out" is still remembered.

Events move so rapidly these later years that citation of great editorial articles of the past is often disappointing. The editorials of Hamilton, Jay and Madison in the *Federalist* are exceptions, because they deal with principles that do not alter, though the occasion for their utterance has passed. How little, in fourteen years and through the wreck and shatter of a great war, have circumstances changed to alter the effectiveness of the editorial written by Cobb in 1909 upon the confusion of ideals in the old historic parties! The heading, "The Twilight of the Gods," illustrated his happy talent for devising brief and attention-compelling titles.

The Baltimore Convention of 1912 was to furnish an instance where Mr. Cobb's editorial pen was not merely to chronicle history but to help make it. *The World* had advocated the nomination of Woodrow Wilson not only for the sake of securing a capable Executive but as the most promising method of heading off a strangely assorted group of practical politicians and scheming business men who had gained control of the movement to nominate Champ Clark of Missouri. So notorious and open became these influences in the convention that on Thursday night, June 27, William J. Bryan introduced his famous resolution, which was passed with some alteration, beginning, "We hereby declare ourselves opposed to the nomination of any candidate for President who is the representative or under any obligation to J. Pierpont Morgan, Thomas F. Ryan, August Belmont, or any other of the privilege-hunting or favor-seeking class." Mr. Ryan was a delegate from Virginia.

After the forty-third ballot on Saturday the convention adjourned over Sunday, a most unusual thing, with Wilson in the lead and gaining, but with far from a two-

thirds vote, and with many hours available for dickerings in secret corners. It was in these circumstances that Mr. Cobb printed, in typographic display unusual with *World* editorials, the solemn warning which had much to do with the nomination of Mr. Wilson in the first ballot taken Monday morning.

More than eight years later Mr. Cobb was to print, March 4, 1920, a long editorial article, afterward republished in pamphlet form, and now included in this volume, entitled "Woodrow Wilson—an Interpretation," which was perhaps the fairest and completest pen-picture ever presented of the great War President.

Since the close of military operations in 1918 Mr. Cobb had been sought by many organizations as a public speaker and his views on public affairs were often solicited by magazine editors. Such invitations were in most cases declined. Exceptions were made when in November, 1921, he printed an article in *The Atlantic Monthly*, detailing the shocking expenditures still made for warlike purposes, even with the example of the Great War before humanity for its guidance; when in January, 1920, he spoke before the City Club of New York, describing how freedom of press and speech and even thought had been curbed during the war and how freedom in peace was endangered by those who would continue such practices; as when, in *Harper's Magazine* for June, 1923, he pointed out that "of all the self-governing nations that emerged from the blood and welter of the World War, none of them fashioned its Constitution after that of the United States; all of them rejected Congressional Government in favor of Parliamentary Government"—and asked some pertinent questions why world fashions in constitution framing had changed.

Simple and unassuming, ready with sympathy and wise in the nature of his fellow men, Frank Cobb made friends without effort.



He loved music and understood it well. He read easily for recreation the fiction and the philosophy of Paris and Berlin as well as of New York and London. A quiet game of dominoes in a corner of the Manhattan Club or a bout at story-telling rested him for his exacting work. Part of his annual vacation was always spent on Moosehead Lake, Maine, where with 'Lijah, his faithful old guide, he caught big fish—squaretails, salmon, togue or lakers—often by sheer persistence for long hours, where others failed for lack of patience. "I am going fishing," he said as his life ended.

Some years ago he bought a farm in Westport, Conn., where during week-ends it was his pleasure to fuss about with practical work on the buildings or at the dam above which he harvested his annual crop of ice. It was to this farm that he returned in July, 1923, from his last trip to the Maine woods, where he had a wide circle of friends, when his fatal illness was already upon him. It was from this farm that, a few days later, he returned to his city home in order to be near his physicians for treatment.

Mr. Cobb was a director and the first vice president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Gov. Nathan Miller appointed him a member of the Board of Managers of the Manhattan State Hospital; he was chairman of the Publicity Committee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and a member of various social organizations. His favorite haunt when off duty and away from his home was the Manhattan Club, where he was a leading promoter of mental athletics at "The Boarding House Table." When on duty, but roaming from his desk, he frequented, all day long, the news rooms, studying the news first hand as it came from the special correspondents, press associations and from reporters and rewrite men who had gathered it at the telephone.

In 1913 Cobb married Margaret Hubbard Ayer, her-

self a *World* writer in former days and the daughter of Harriet Hubbard Ayer, whom all older readers of *The World* will remember. Of this union there are two children, Jane and Hubbard Cobb. Of civic honors Cobb was not one to make display. He was a Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor and the Belgian Order of Leopold, but probably nobody ever saw him display their ribbons upon his coat.

\* \* \*

Frank Cobb would have regarded with pity and contempt one who wrote at his direction that which the writer did not himself believe to be true. Like an impatient general in employing his intellectual forces in battle, his sometimes brusque manner was merely evidence of the sincerity of his own belief. He had nothing but disgust for one who bent and trimmed opinions to meet time and circumstance and the pleasuring of an accidental authority.

Mr. Cobb would not write six lines about himself for "Who's Who," but he would spend hours and weeks preparing himself to spread and defend his theories of American destiny and human liberty and honesty, whether before an august assembly of publicists or a bewildered and groping neighborhood improvement society made up of newly mixed components in the East Side melting pot.

Mr. Watterson's estimate of Frank Cobb was made in attacking one of the policies to which Cobb gave all that was in him—that of the League of Nations. The impression left by Frank Cobb is to be found most firmly marked among people who disagreed with him while respecting and loving him. No man better enjoyed being loved; and no man would have less pardoned a sacrifice of honest opinion to that affection.

Frank Cobb was an inveterate conversationalist. He liked to be where others were talking; he was at his best when talking himself, whether with one listener, two or a hall full. But his enthusiasm for narrative and con-

troversy and homily was for ideas, his own or those of others, and not at all for Frank Cobb the individual. What those close to him knew of his life came as off hand recollections of experiences or persons which he told to illustrate a situation or a character or to point a moral.

It was part of his nature to accumulate the attributes of culture as a forest tree draws stature from the air and from its native soil. He did not learn French or German in the district school or the normal school. But he had a facility in both. His love of classical music was critical and not a mere sense satisfaction of harmony. His scientific insight and his keeping pace with modern research were such that he was safe from the humiliation of finding he had blindly followed the glamorous lure of crackpot genius or sordid charlatan.

It was not in Frank Cobb to "talk down" to any man. The university bred intellectual met him on ground which Cobb had reached by another path; but the old crony from the lumber camp was no more conscious of the grasp of affairs and the arts which had come to his newspaper friend than was the editor himself. Frank Cobb's human philosophy was sound; he had to set up no artificial transmission lines for a mutual understanding with another man, whether friendly or unfriendly.

No man better enjoyed being friendly. His healthy good nature was such that unless he spoke in righteous anger—which could not be mistaken by the thickest-hided offender who ever lived—the boisterous exaggerations of his play of humor could not sting. Words which from another would have drawn an angry retort or a fight were accepted as affectionate demonstrations to be answered with a grin—or did the object of them dare a contest bound to be unequal, an essay to make reply in the same spirit.

His visits to the *Evening World* gave a zest to the day's work; he might be in his shirt-sleeves, hurrying to snatch a bit of information needed in a half-written edi-

torial; he may have been running tumultuously to be the first to tell a story to one who would best appreciate it; he might come with what he believed to be an overpowering rejoinder to one with whom he had an argumentative difference; he might pass through to shout (for the edification of an executive) appreciation of good work done by the least considered of the staff; or it might be to express sympathy in misfortune by pausing to press a comforting hand upon a friend's shoulder. Wherever he moved, he radiated his warmth of friendship and cheer.

Was a precise and notably abstemious veteran out of sorts and testy? Frank Cobb would openly charge him with paying the penalty of a night of riotous living. Had the most emphatic advocate of immediate and universal recognition of Irish freedom, national and individual, appeared in new raiment? Frank Cobb would proclaim that the new clothes had been "bought with British gold." Saturday afternoons did not seem to end the week's work properly—when his illness kept him from the office—because he did not appear in hat and overcoat, to make sure at the last moment nothing in the news had happened to interfere with his week-end trip to the farm and also to assure all present of his contempt for "poor wage-slave worms" who could not go out and play—quite oblivious to the contradiction exhibited by the worn traveling bag in which he took the material for his own labor to the country with him.

The energy generated by his enthusiasms exerted, sometimes, astonishing power for overcoming obstacles. A reporter, sent to Washington when a national railroad strike threatened in 1916, heard Woodrow Wilson read his message to Congress on the emergency. It was after the "dead line" hour, too late for any but a surprisingly novel and important despatch to be written, telegraphed, edited, headed and placed in type to catch the last edition of *The Evening World*.

The reporter, thinking to aid Cobb in the preparation of his morning editorial by earlier information than that arriving late at night in the 'deliberately written' despatches to the morning edition, jotted down his observation of the manner in which the assembled Congress received each paragraph of the message and sent it to Cobb by telegraph.

In that evening's last issue, the reporter was astonished to find those notes in print, leading the strike situation news of the day. All rules, all mechanical difficulties, the consideration that he was least of all charged with the supervision of the evening edition's news service, had been swept away before the rush of his conviction that Woodrow Wilson's counsel and its impression upon Congress were the vital news of the moment and should be published instantly.

Something has been said of his fearlessness of authority derived from title or other worldly man-made associations. His intellectual and affectionate absorption in Woodrow Wilson is known, but he had the reputation of speaking his mind to Mr. Wilson as no one else dared who was not discarded from Mr. Wilson's counsel.

With Theodore Roosevelt, as might be assumed, he was ever in joyous antagonism. Cobb probably thought better of Roosevelt than Roosevelt thought of Cobb. It was not in President Roosevelt to dismiss a suspicion that there must be a trace of criminality in one who so frankly and continually fought him—he never quite forgave *The World* editorials on the failure of the Panama Canal libel prosecutions.

Yet Cobb attributed to Mr. Roosevelt no small share in his selection as Joseph Pulitzer's editorial chief of staff. When Theodore Roosevelt passed through Detroit, campaigning as Republican candidate for Vice President, there was drawn to his attention on the ferry taking him from Windsor to Detroit a highly displeasing

editorial in the *Free Press* on a historical analogy cited by himself in the course of a recent speech. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, summoned the reporter of the *Free Press* and gave him a verbal vicarious castigation. He challenged Cobb's accuracy of statement and his sanity of reasoning. He demanded that Cobb be brought before him or that he at least make public acknowledgment of error.

The reply, published in the next day's *Free Press*, quoted dates and texts and authoritative opinions and was almost jeeringly defiant in triumph. There was no Roosevelt counter-demand or rebuttal; Roosevelt sought out the young editor as a friend. And with the highest ideals of Americanism and humanity in common they battled over the expression of them until Roosevelt's death. Mr. Williams, asking questions about Cobb in Detroit, heard the story of this clash. It gave color to the report which resulted in Mr. Pulitzer's choice of an editor.

But though he feared nothing else on earth, Frank Cobb feared a bore as he hated a sneak. He knew how to rid himself of the company of a sneak, but before a bore he fled with an abject dismay like that of the Kansas farmers of his father's generation who retreated from the grasshoppers to the woods of Michigan.



## A PERSONAL TRIBUTE

In Frank I. Cobb I have lost a tender and devoted friend, Journalism has lost an editor of sheer genius and the Nation an American who will leave an emptiness where he stood.

He gave *The World* his love and his life. He gave it his work in a spirit of worship. In the days of his health he spent his magnificent strength without stint in its service. In later days of tired suffering, as long as his ebbing strength could still carry him to his desk, it was in his work alone that he found forgetfulness of his pain.

He had a giant body and a giant brain, and the simple directness of a little child. He spent his life fighting wrong and he fought it simply and fiercely, but all the wounds he left healed clean. Everything he handled became simple in his handling of it. Sometimes he would simplify a bewildering situation or a tangled thought with one easy touch of intuitive analysis. Sometimes he would labor with his might on some cunningly elusive subtlety, and in the end his directness would simplify it into surrender.

He thought simply and hated sophistry. He wrote simply and hated florid phrases. He lived simply and hated fuss and feathers. He succeeded simply and became a power and a personality in the United States, writing editorials he did not sign in a paper he did not own.

The simplicity of his mind, the modesty of his heart, the integrity of his spirit lived with him. But they will not die with him. They are already preserved as a bright tradition among those of us who had the honor of working with him and for those who will come after us.

RALPH PULITZER.





COBB OF "THE WORLD"



# COBB OF "THE WORLD"

---

## CHAPTER I

### PANAMA

WHEN Theodore Roosevelt as President "took" the Panama Canal belt, *The World* as a matter of general policy criticised the act, but soon abandoned the critical attitude as useless in face of a fact accomplished. In the Taft campaign of 1908 William Nelson Cromwell complained to District Attorney Jerome that certain persons were trying to blackmail him in connection with the sale by the French company of Panama Canal rights to the United States. The substance of the complaint, becoming known to *The World*, was printed as a news article, October 3, 1908, with a telephoned disclaimer by Mr. Cromwell. For a month no attention was paid to the article, and to several that followed, by President Roosevelt, who was in effect managing the Taft campaign for the Presidency. On the day before the election the Indianapolis *News* printed an editorial on the Panama scandal—as it had become—asking who got the \$40,000,000 the United States paid for the property. The result of the elections in Indiana was unsatisfactory to the Administration. On Nov. 29 William Dudley Foulke of that State sent the Indianapolis *News* editorial to Mr. Roosevelt in a letter declaring that if the statements were true the people ought to know it, and if they were not

true "a journal that disseminates falsehoods" should be exposed. Mr. Roosevelt, replying on Dec. 1, 1908, asserted that the United States "paid \$40,000,000 direct to the French Government," and that there was no syndicate of capitalists in the United States that had had dealings with the Government for the Canal. Upon this *The World* for the first time commented upon the matter editorially. In the article immediately following, written by Mr. Cobb, which appeared Dec. 8, 1908, the famous fight was on. After some preliminary inquiry by the Department of Justice, Attorney-General Bonaparte, under orders from President Roosevelt, began criminal proceedings Feb. 17, 1909, in the courts of the District of Columbia against *The World*, the Indianapolis *News* and certain editors as individuals. The suits were based upon the circulation of the two newspapers in the District of Columbia and charged libel of President Roosevelt, President-elect Taft and others. Mr. Taft was to take office in a fortnight, inheriting the contest begun by his impetuous predecessor.

## THE PANAMA SCANDAL—LET CONGRESS INVESTIGATE

[December 8, 1908]

IN view of President Roosevelt's deliberate misstatements of fact in his scandalous personal attack upon Mr. Delavan Smith, editor of the Indianapolis *News*, *The World* calls upon the Congress of the United States to make immediately a full and impartial investigation of the entire Panama Canal scandal.

The investigation of 1906 by the Senate Committee on Interoceanic Canals was blocked by the refusal of William Nelson Cromwell to answer the most pertinent questions of Senator Morgan, of Alabama. Since that

time nothing has been done because after Senator Morgan's death there was no successor to carry on his great work of revealing the truth about Panama corruption.

The Indianapolis *News* said in the editorial for which Mr. Roosevelt assails Mr. Smith:

It has been charged that the United States bought from American citizens for \$40,000,000 property that cost those citizens \$12,000,000. There is no doubt that the Government paid \$40,000,000 for the property. But who got the money?

President Roosevelt's reply to this most proper question is for the most part a string of abusive and defamatory epithets. But he also makes the following statements as truthful information to the American people.

The United States did not pay a cent of the \$40,000,000 to any American citizen.

The Government paid this \$40,000,000 direct to the French Government, getting the receipt of the liquidator appointed by the French Government to receive the same.

The United States Government has not the slightest knowledge as to the particular individuals among whom the French Government distributed the same.

So far as I know there was no syndicate; there certainly was no syndicate in the United States that to my knowledge had any dealings with the Government directly or indirectly.

*To the best of The World's knowledge and belief, each and all of these statements made by Mr. Roosevelt and quoted above are untrue, and Mr. Roosevelt must have known they were untrue when he made them.*

## WHO GOT THE MONEY?

As to the detailed description of the Panama loot only one man knows it all. And that man is William Nelson Cromwell. The two men who were most in Mr. Cromwell's confidence are Theodore Roosevelt, President of

the United States, and Elihu Root, former Secretary of War and now Secretary of State. It was they who aided Mr. Cromwell in consummating the Panama revolution, arranged the terms of the purchase of the Panama Canal, made the agreement to pay \$40,000,000 for the canal properties and an additional \$10,000,000 for a manufactured Panama republic, every penny of both of which sums was paid by check on the United States Treasury to J. P. Morgan & Co.—not to the French Government, as Mr. Roosevelt says, but to J. P. Morgan & Co.

The natural query of the *Indianapolis News* as to "who got the money" was based on *The World's* historical summary of Mr. Cromwell's connection with the Panama Canal. The inquiry was originally *The World's*, and *The World* accepts Mr. Roosevelt's challenge. If Congress can have all the documents in the case, as Mr. Roosevelt says, let Congress make a complete investigation of the Panama Canal affair, and in particular of William Nelson Cromwell's relations with the French company, with Panama and with the Government of the United States. Let Congress officially answer this question: "Who got the money?"

The old French company organized by Ferdinand de Lesseps in 1879 failed in 1889, years before Mr. Cromwell's relations with President Roosevelt began. As Mr. Cromwell testified before the Senate Committee on Feb. 26, 1906, "we never had any connection with the so-called de Lesseps company. Neither did the United States Government conduct negotiations with the old French Panama Canal Company."

#### CROMWELL'S CONTRACT:

What Mr. Cromwell did represent was the new Panama Canal Company, the American Panama Canal Company, and the \$5,000,000 syndicate which he formed to

finance the new companies. After Mr. Cromwell had testified "I do not recall any contract," Senator Morgan produced a contract reading (Panama Canal Hearing, Vol. II, page 1146):

Mr. William Nelson Cromwell is exclusively empowered, under the formal agreement with the Board of Directors of the Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama (New Panama Canal Company of France) to effect with an American syndicate the Americanization of the Panama Canal Company on the following basis.

The basis on which Mr. Cromwell was "exclusively empowered" in this contract was that an American Panama Canal Company with a capitalization of \$60,000,000 preferred and \$45,000,000 common should be organized to take over the Panama Canal concessions and all other property belonging to the new French Panama Canal Company, which had bought the same from the old de Lesseps company. This company was incorporated in New Jersey with dummy directors. There was also incorporated in New Jersey with dummy directors the Inter-oceanic Canal Company.

Senator Morgan unearthed a copy of the \$5,000,000 syndicate agreement, which provided that the subscribers should contract with William Nelson Cromwell to pay \$5,000,000 in cash and to take their several allotments in the enterprise.

Five million dollars was more than ample to buy the majority of the old Panama stock. As *The World* said on Oct. 25:

Mr. Cromwell applied to the canal situation the methods of American high finance by which a syndicate takes over the property of a bankrupt concern, then creates a holding company and a recapitalization, keeping the majority control in a syndicate trusteeship.



Following that, to quote from Mr. Cromwell's testimony, "in May, 1904, I, representing the new Panama Canal, and Judges Day and Russell, representing Attorney-General Knox, consummated" the transfer and sale to the United States.

Mr. Roosevelt says, *"the Government paid this \$40,000,000 direct to the French Government."*

Mr. Cromwell testified that the *United States paid the money to J. P. Morgan & Co.*

Mr. Roosevelt says, *"the French Government distributed the sum."*

Mr. Cromwell testifies as to how *he distributed it.*

Mr. Roosevelt talks of *"getting the receipt of the liquidator appointed by the French Government to receive the same."*

Mr. Cromwell testified: *"Of the \$40,000,000 thus paid by the United States Government \$25,000,000 was paid to the liquidator of the old Panama Canal Company under and in pursuance of an agreement entered into between the liquidator and the new company. . . . Of the balance of \$15,000,000 paid to the new Panama Canal Company \$12,000,000 have already been distributed among its stockholders, and the remainder is now being held awaiting final distribution and payment."*

What follows is further eloquent testimony taken by the Senate committee:

Senator Taliaferro: There is \$3,000,000?

Mr. Cromwell: Three million. Yes, sir.

Senator Taliaferro: Who holds the money?

Mr. Cromwell: The new Panama Canal Company in its treasury.

And yet Mr. Roosevelt says that "the United States Government has not the slightest knowledge" as to the distribution of the \$40,000,000 and that "this was the business of the French Government."

As to Mr. Roosevelt's statement that "there was no syndicate," he could have read the "syndicate subscription agreement" on page 1150, Vol. II, of the testimony before the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals—if he had cared for the truth.

### HOW THE REVOLUTION WAS MANUFACTURED:

That the United States Government was not 'dealing with "the French Government," or "the liquidator appointed by the French Government," or with Colombia, or with Panama, or with any one else except William Nelson Cromwell and his associates, is made still more plain by the 'description of Señor J. Gabriel Duque as to the Panama revolution and as to the manner in which Mr. Cromwell got \$10,000,000 additional from the United States Treasury. Señor Duque said:

Mr. Cromwell made the revolution. He offered to make me President of the new republic and to see me through if I would raise a small force of men and declare a secession from Colombia. He made promises that we should have the help of his Government. . . . It was accompanied by a liberal use of money. We bought this general and that one, paying \$3,000 to \$4,000 per general. The Colombian officers were all paid off and the Colombian general who was sent to stop the revolution was also bought off.

Then Mr. Cromwell, having been elected by the Panama Republic as general counsel, and he and J. Pierpont Morgan having been appointed a "fiscal commission," negotiated with President Roosevelt, by which the United States paid \$10,000,000 more to the "fiscal commission" for Mr. Cromwell's Panama Republic. Of this money three-quarters is still under the control of "the fiscal commission."

Why did the United States pay \$40,000,000 for a bankrupt property whose control could undoubtedly have

been bought in the open market for less than \$4,000,000?

Who were the new Panama Canal Company?

Who bought up the obligations of the old Panama Canal Company for a few cents on the dollar?

Among whom was divided the \$15,000,000 paid to the new Panama Canal Company?

Whether Douglas Robinson, who is Mr. Roosevelt's brother-in-law, or any of Mr. Taft's brothers associated himself with Mr. Cromwell in Panama exploitation or shared in these profits is incidental to the main issue of letting in the light.

Whether they did or did not, whether all the profits went into William Nelson Cromwell's hands or whatever became of them, the fact that Theodore Roosevelt as President of the United States issues a public statement about such an important matter full of flagrant untruths, reeking with misstatements, challenging line by line the testimony of his associate Cromwell and the official record, makes it imperative that full publicity come at once through the authority and by the action of Congress.

### LESE-MAJESTY

[December 16, 1908]

MR. ROOSEVELT is mistaken. He cannot muzzle *The World*.

While no amount of billingsgate on his part can alter our determination to treat him with judicial impartiality and scrupulous fairness, we repeat that we have already said—that the Congress of the United States should make a thorough investigation of the whole Panama transaction, that the full truth may be known to the American people.

It is a most extraordinary circumstance that Mr.

Roosevelt himself did not demand such an inquiry. All his protestations of outraged virtue, all his torrents of imprecation and denunciation end with the amazing assertion that "there is nothing whatever in which this Government is interested to investigate about this transaction."

*The World* fully appreciates the compliment paid to it by Mr. Roosevelt in making it the subject of a special message to the Congress of the United States. In the whole history of American government no other President has ever paid such a tribute to the power and influence of a fearless, independent newspaper.

*The World* likewise appreciates the importance and significance of Mr. Roosevelt's statement when he declares to Congress that the proprietor of *The World* "should be prosecuted for libel by the government authorities," and that "the Attorney-General has under consideration the form under which the proceedings against Mr. Pulitzer shall be brought."

This is the first time a President ever asserted the doctrine of lese-majesty, or proposed, in the absence of specific legislation, the criminal prosecution by the Government of citizens who criticised the conduct of the Government or the conduct of individuals who may have had business dealings with the Government. Neither the King of Great Britain nor the German Emperor would venture to arrogate such power to himself. John Adams's attempt to enforce the sedition law destroyed the Federalist party in America. Yet Mr. Roosevelt, in the absence of law, officially proposes to use all the power of the greatest government on earth to cripple the freedom of the press on the pretext that the Government itself has been libelled—and he is the Government.

We are aware that for many years Mr. Roosevelt has been savagely displeased with the editorial conduct of *The World*. It is true that we have criticised him sharply

and frankly whenever we believed the public interest required, just as we have heartily commended and supported him whenever we believed the public interest would thereby be advanced. Mr. Roosevelt's attack on *The World* can be explained only on the theory that he believes he can muzzle the paper, and our recent impeachment of his veracity seems to have been the last straw that broke his autocratic back.

It is true that *The World* printed the public reports concerning the Panama Canal affair which resulted from William Nelson Cromwell's appeal to the District-Attorney's office during the recent campaign to prevent the publication of a story which was said to be in the hands of the Democratic National Committee. It was Mr. Cromwell's own action which raised the issue in the campaign.

It is true also that when Mr. Roosevelt made his attack upon Delavan Smith *The World* called attention to certain statements which Mr. Roosevelt must have known to be false and misleading and appealed to Congress to end all scandal by a full and impartial investigation. If this be treason, let Mr. Roosevelt make the most of it.

Mr. Roosevelt's lamentable habit of inaccurate statement makes it impossible to accept either his judgments or his conclusions. In his message he does not state correctly even so simple a matter as the pretended causes of his grievance.

He says, for example, that *The World* asserted that there was "corruption by or on behalf of the Government of the United States." No such charge was made by this newspaper.

He says it was asserted that there were "improper dealings of some kind between agents of the Government and outside persons." No such charge was made.

He says that "among those persons who, it was al-

leged, made 'huge profits' were Mr. Charles P. Taft, a brother of Mr. William H. Taft, then candidate for the Presidency, and Mr. Douglas Robinson, my brother-in-law." No such charge was made.

*The World* has never said that Charles P. Taft or Douglas Robinson made any profits whatever. Mr. Taft denied that he was concerned in the transaction in any way, which denial *The World* published and accepted. It would have been equally glad to print Mr. Robinson's denial could it have succeeded in obtaining one from him, as it frequently attempted. *The World* has no evidence that he was associated with Mr. Cromwell, and would accept his word to that effect; for Mr. Robinson is an estimable gentleman of high character, whose reputation for veracity is infinitely better than that of his distinguished brother-in-law.

If *The World* has libelled anybody we hope it will be punished, but we do not intend to be intimidated by Mr. Roosevelt's threats, or by Mr. Roosevelt's denunciation, or by Mr. Roosevelt's power.

Mr. Roosevelt's seething indignation about *The World's* "libel upon the United States Government" is an exquisite indictment indeed, coming as it does from a President who less than a week ago officially insinuated in his message that the Congress of the United States was composed of scoundrels who amended an appropriation bill because "Congressmen did not themselves wish to be investigated by Secret Service men."

No other living man ever so grossly libelled the United States as does the President who besmirches Congress, bulldozes Judges, assails the integrity of courts, slanders private citizens, and who has shown himself the most reckless, unscrupulous demagogue whom the American people ever trusted with great power and authority.

We say this not in anger but in sincere sorrow. *The World* has immeasurably more respect for the office of

President of the United States than Theodore Roosevelt has ever shown during the years in which he has maintained a reign of terror and vilified the honor and honesty of both public officials and private citizens who opposed his policies or thwarted him in his purposes.

So far as *The World* is concerned, its proprietor may go to jail, if Mr. Roosevelt succeeds, as he threatens; but even in jail *The World* will not cease to be a fearless champion of free speech, a free press and a free people.

It cannot be muzzled.

### A POLITICAL PERSECUTION

[February 18, 1909]

MR. ROOSEVELT is mistaken. He cannot muzzle *The World*, even though he revive by Executive order the infamous Sedition law which destroyed the Federalist party and made Thomas Jefferson President of the United States.

Although the indictments returned by the Grand Jury of the District of Columbia yesterday, in form, allege that criminal libel was committed against Theodore Roosevelt, William H. Taft, Elihu Root, J. Pierpont Morgan, Charles P. Taft, Douglas Robinson and William Nelson Cromwell, the case in reality is a political proceeding instituted by Mr. Roosevelt as President against the two great newspapers in the North which supported the Democratic national ticket last fall.

He said in his special message of Dec. 15, referring to certain articles about the purchase of the Panama Canal, "*they are in fact wholly and in form partly a libel upon the United States Government*," adding that "*the real offender is Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, editor and proprietor of The World*"; that Mr. Pulitzer "*should be prosecuted for libel by the Governmental authorities*," and

that "*the Attorney-General has under consideration the form in which the proceedings against Mr. Pulitzer shall be brought.*"

In accordance with this form, the first indictments have been found in the District of Columbia under what Elihu Root himself described in the case of *Noyes vs. Dana* as "*the same arbitrary and odious law against which Erskine fought in the days of George III.*" Mr. Roosevelt is employing all his power as President of the United States to use this "same arbitrary and odious law" to smother the freedom of the press.

This persecution, if it succeed, will place every newspaper in the country which circulates in Washington—and there are few of importance which do not circulate there—completely at the mercy of any autocratic, vainglorious President who is willing to prostitute his authority for the gratification of his personal malice. Few newspapers make large profits. Most of them could be ruined financially by the legal expense of defending themselves hundreds of miles from the place of publication and against the tremendous resources of the United States Government.

Under this procedure there is hardly an American newspaper proprietor who would not be liable to criminal indictment in Washington if his newspaper printed something offensive to the President, even though the proprietor might have been thousands of miles from his office at the time of such publication and known nothing whatever about it. There is hardly an editor or writer or reporter who would not be similarly liable to indictment at the whim of a President. In addition to this, all of them would likewise be liable to criminal indictment, as District-Attorney Stimson declares, "in a number of separate and independent jurisdictions"—that is, in the jurisdiction of all the 2,809 Government reservations in which copies of the newspaper might happen to have circulated.



If proof were needed that these indictments are in reality a political proceeding, instituted by Mr. Roosevelt against the two leading anti-Republican newspapers in the recent campaign, it would be necessary only to review his conduct during that contest. The articles chiefly complained of appeared in the news columns of *The World*, between Oct. 3 and Oct. 16. At that time Mr. Roosevelt was the actual manager of the Republican campaign, and had been engaged in violent personal controversies with Mr. Bryan, Gov. Haskell and various other opponents. If he believe that the Panama articles printed in *The World* and the Indianapolis *News* were a libel upon the United States Government, or upon himself or Mr. Taft or Mr. Root, or upon anybody else, that was the time to join the issue and submit it to the judgment of the American people at the polls. Yet, although Mr. Roosevelt's political activities were unceasing, *never once did he refer to this Panama matter, never a complaint did he make in regard to these articles, never did he challenge the Democratic party or its candidates or any of its supporters to meet this issue of criminal libel which he now raises on the eve of his retirement from office.*

Even in his letter of Dec. 1 to William D. Foulke, viciously assailing Delavan Smith for what the Indianapolis *News* had printed about the Panama affair, Mr. Roosevelt made no charge against *The World* and made no claim that anybody had been libelled. On the contrary, he was careful to explain that "he would prefer to make no answer whatever in this case." "My plan," he said, "has been to go ahead to do the work and let these people and those like them yell." It was not until *The World* in its issue of Dec. 8 reproached Mr. Roosevelt for grave inveracities in his attack upon Mr. Smith and Mr. Laffan,<sup>1</sup> and urged a Congressional investigation to establish the full truth about the Panama Canal pur-

<sup>1</sup>Of the New York *Sun*.

chase that he raised the question of "a libel upon the United States Government" and announced in a message to Congress his determination to have Mr. Pulitzer "prosecuted for libel by the governmental authorities."

This threat was only one element in the Reign of Terror which Mr. Roosevelt instituted as soon as the election was over. He had already slandered citizens and Congress and the courts. An assault upon the freedom of the press was logically the next step in the gratification of his revenge upon everybody who had dared to interfere with his policies, projects or purposes. And in carrying out his scheme to employ the Government of the United States to punish newspapers which have fearlessly criticised him he has let it be known, in the words of the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent, that Federal office-holders charged with these proceedings "*will earn his gratitude if their efforts are successful.*"

The formal charges in the indictments bear only a nominal relation to the actual offense which the President seeks to prosecute. The real offense of *The World* is that for years it has consistently opposed on principle Mr. Roosevelt's jingoism, his militarism, his cowboy methods of administration and his government by denunciation, and has never hesitated to tell the blunt truth about him whenever the public welfare so required.

The real offense of the *Indianapolis News* is that it refused to support the Republican ticket last fall, thereby costing the Indiana Republicans the Governor, a United States Senator, the State Legislature and several Representatives in Congress in that closely debatable State. Mr. Roosevelt is now abusing his great power as President and prostituting his great authority as President to exploit his political malice. These libel proceedings have no other object than to enable Mr. Roosevelt to employ the machinery of the United States Government to satisfy his personal desire for revenge.

We say this reluctantly, but we say it without qualification, because it is true. And we say further that whatever indictments Mr. Roosevelt may cause to be brought, in however many "distinct and independent jurisdictions," against *The World* or against Mr. Pulitzer or against editors of *The World*, he will not intimidate this newspaper or swerve it in the slightest degree from the performance of its public duty.

Mr. Roosevelt is an episode. *The World* is an institution. Long after Mr. Roosevelt is dead, long after Mr. Pulitzer is dead, long after all the present editors of this paper are dead, *The World* will still go on as a great independent newspaper, unmuzzled, undaunted and unterrorized.

#### PLAIN FACTS ABOUT A POLITICAL PERSECUTION

[February 23, 1909]

MR. ROOSEVELT, Mr. Cromwell, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Root are all citizens of New York. *The World* is published in the City of New York and is fully responsible under all the civil and criminal laws of the State of New York. Yet not one of these nominal complainants in the District of Columbia proceedings has ever made complaint to the District Attorney of New York County against *The World*, or undertaken any action whatever against it in the jurisdiction in which it is legally responsible for every line which it prints.

Instead, proceedings were instigated by Mr. Roosevelt in the courts of the District of Columbia, where the English common law of 1662 is still in force, and before the Federal courts of the Southern District of New York, the claim being made that the act of 1825 relative to the malicious injury of property on Government reservations

can be twisted into a Federal libel law, provided the publication happens to have circulated at West Point or Fort Slocum or in some other reservation. This is further illuminated by the theory advanced by District-Attorney Stimson that the National Government has authority to carry on such prosecutions "in a number of separate and independent jurisdictions"; that is to say, in all the jurisdictions which include the 2,809 Government reservations.

### A HISTORY-MAKING CASE

[June 3, 1909]

AT the request of the United States attorneys the hearing at Indianapolis in the Panama Canal libel suit was adjourned yesterday to Oct. 11. This is the proceeding against the Indianapolis *News* for having printed that Americans profited by the sale of the Panama Canal to the United States and that part of the \$10,000,000 which the United States paid found its way into a syndicate's pockets.

For this an indictment was procured by Mr. Roosevelt, not in Indianapolis, where the paper is printed, and where the offense, if any, was committed, but in Washington, in the District of Columbia, hundreds of miles away. On this indictment the Special Assistant Attorney-General applied to the Federal Judge sitting in Indianapolis for the extradition to Washington of the owner and the editor.

Prior to these publications in the Indianapolis *News*, *The World* had printed similar statements for which *The World* was indicted by Mr. Roosevelt in Washington, although no attempt has yet been made to serve the warrants or to extradite any one connected with *The World*.

The proceedings before Judge Anderson in Indianap-

olis involves a great constitutional question—whether the President of the United States or any other man sufficiently powerful to influence the Department of Justice, may procure the forcible removal to Washington of any newspaper proprietor, editor or reporter who lives, works and writes anywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States and whose political criticism happens to circulate in the District of Columbia.

Even in the days of the Alien and Sedition laws any person accused of libelling the Government of the United States or the President or the Congress was entitled to a trial at his home, among the community of his neighbors and associates, where he and his reputation were known. However foreign the Alien and Sedition laws were to American spirit, they did not change the rule since the time of the Magna Charta that the man accused of crime was entitled to be tried by a jury of the vicinage.

An attempt approaching this was made in 1895 when a resident of Washington as a private complainant instituted libel proceedings for the extradition of Mr. Dana, of the New York *Sun*, which application was refused by Judge Addison Brown, who quoted the language of Judge Cooley:

It would be a singular result of a revolution where one of the grievances complained of was an assertion of a right to send parties abroad for trial if it should be found that an editor may be seized anywhere in the Union and transported by a Federal officer to every territory into which the paper may find its way, to be tried in each in succession for offenses which consisted in a single act not actually committed in any of them.

Judge Brown also said:

Libel as a criminal offense either against the Government or against private persons is not and never has been an offense anywhere triable in the Federal courts of this country.

No Federal court has cognizance of such a case as this, and as between the States there is no extradition except of fugitives from justice. This defendant is not a fugitive; he has not fled from the District of Columbia. He was not there, and there is no such thing as constructive flight.

In the proceedings instituted by Mr. Roosevelt even the jurisdictional residence of the complainant which existed in the Dana case does not appear. Mr. Roosevelt, the real complainant, was a legal resident not of Washington but of Nassau County, N. Y. None of the parties cited in the indictments as aggrieved was a resident of Washington. All with two exceptions were residents of New York. None was a resident of Indiana.

The great constitutional question does not at all involve the merits of Mr. Roosevelt's charge of libel against *The World*, and the *Indianapolis News*. Should this case ever come to trial on its merits the truth of such charges as were actually made can be offered as a complete defense.

That many American citizens have convinced themselves of the necessity for making the full truth public Judge Anderson's remarks yesterday from the bench clearly indicated when he referred to Mr. Cromwell's admission of the existence of an American syndicate and to the Court's own personal impression of the "quick, sudden change of heart from the Nicaragua route to the Panama route."

Great as is the natural interest of the American public, which paid the \$40,000,000, to know into what pocket it finally went, that question is of minor importance compared with the constitutional right which every American citizen has to be tried at his home, where he is known, where the offense, if any, was committed, and not to be dragged hundreds or thousands of miles, though an acquittal follow.

Were Judge Anderson and the higher courts to take

Mr. Roosevelt's view, almost any newspaper editor or writer who criticises the Administration could be taken to Washington and tried there for criminal libel. Not only any newspaper editor but any other citizen who by writing or speech attacked the Administration or its acts could be indicted in Washington, haled to Washington, kept in Washington, without redress and without remedy against the most unjust accusations, if his criticism happened to circulate in Washington. Such a procedure might be equivalent to the confiscation of a man's property and business.

Such a construction of the Constitution and of the law would stifle criticism of Federal officials or adverse comment on the acts of the National Administration. It might apply to a Senator or a Representative as well as to a President, and would destroy that freedom of discussion without which republican institutions cannot be maintained.

Judge Anderson at the hearing before him commented upon several extraordinary phases of the Government's contention:

As, for example, if the proprietor of a newspaper in New York should be off for six months cruising in his yacht, during his absence a vicious article appeared in his paper. Should he be held criminally? It does not occur to me that he could be held criminally liable. If the owner is not present he actually knew nothing about the publication and could not possibly be held guilty of the crime.

Yet this is one of the perverted constructions which the Government is seeking to maintain.

Regarding the question of who got the Panama money, Judge Anderson also said: "This forty millions of dollars that was paid for the canal was the public's money, you must remember. Part of it was my money. A part of it was yours."

*The World* welcomes a hearing before a competent judicial tribunal of this great question. As for the great constitutional issue involved in this case, it is confident that the highest courts in the United States will hold today, as was held in 1895 and as far back as 1812, when John Marshall, Brockholst Livingston and Joseph Story sat, that an American citizen cannot be dragged from his home to Washington for trial for an offense which if committed at all was committed at home, and that no such Federal crime exists as Mr. Roosevelt sought by fiat to create.

### LAW VERSUS LAWLESSNESS—LIBERTY VERSUS LESE-MAJESTY

[October 14, 1909]

JUDGE ANDERSON'S decision against the United States Government in the Panama libel case at Indianapolis is in effect a declaration that President Roosevelt instituted an unconstitutional proceeding which involved a distinct menace to the liberties of the American people.

To quote the language of the Court:

To my mind that man has read the history of our institutions to very little purpose who does not look with very grave apprehension upon the possible success of a proceeding such as this—if the history of liberty means anything, if the constitutional guarantees mean anything—if the prosecuting authorities should have the power to select a tribunal, if there be more than one tribunal to select from, at the capital of the United States; that the Government should have that power and drag citizens of distant States there to be tried.

The defendants will be discharged.

To appreciate the extent to which Mr. Roosevelt prostituted the power of the Presidency to the gratifica-



tion of personal and political malice it is necessary only to compare his own record in the case with this decision of the United States court.

In his special message of Dec. 15, 1908, Mr. Roosevelt declared that the Panama news articles printed in *The World* were "a string of infamous libels"; that "they are in fact wholly and in form partly a libel upon the United States Government"; that the proprietor of *The World* "should be prosecuted for libel by the governmental authorities," and that "the Attorney-General has under consideration the form in which the proceedings . . . shall be brought."

Judge Anderson does not even consider the possibility that the United States Government could be libelled. As to whether anybody was libelled by the Indianapolis *News'* vigorous and sweeping editorial comments, which went beyond *The World's* news articles the Court says:

I was very strongly impressed this morning with Mr. Winter's argument on the proposition that these articles are not libellous. Up to that time it had not occurred to me that there was any question about their being libellous, but I am not so sure about it. . . . I have had occasion to say before that a newspaper has a sort of duty to perform. It was well stated by a former Judge of the United States: "It is the duty of a newspaper to print the news and tell the truth about it." It is the duty of a public newspaper such as is owned and conducted by these defendants to tell the people, its subscribers, the facts that it may find out about public questions or matter of public interest. It is its duty and its right to draw inference from the facts known, to draw them for the people.

Judge Anderson's decision overthrows a revolutionary doctrine which, were it sustained by the courts, would inevitably destroy the freedom of the press in this country. How long would newspapers dare criticise abuses of Government or oppose the will of the Executives if the President could arbitrarily take editors and proprietors

to Washington and there prosecute them criminally under what Elihu Root eloquently described as "the same arbitrary and odious law against which Erskine fought in the days of George III"?

From a time that antedates the adoption of the Constitution freedom of the press has been held to be one of essential safeguards of American liberty. Freedom of the press is never more necessary than in a period in which the Republic produces a President who officially asserts the doctrine of lese-majesty and who wantonly prostitutes the power of his office and degrades the instrumentalities of justice in order to gratify his desire for private revenge.

The Court has answered Mr. Roosevelt.

### A CROOK AND A JACKASS

[October 24, 1910]

THAT Mr. Roosevelt during his recent visit to Indianapolis should have denounced Judge Anderson of the United States District Court as "a crook and a jackass" will astonish nobody who is familiar with Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward an independent judiciary.

Judge Anderson's offense was his decision in "that libel case out here." "That libel case out here" was the attempt of the United States Government to drag the editors of the Indianapolis *News* to Washington for trial for what had been printed in their newspaper about the sale of the Panama Canal properties to the United States.

The Indianapolis *News* indictments in the District of Columbia were found at the same time *The World* indictments were found, at the personal demand of Mr. Roosevelt, who announced through the *Tribune* that—

The President is deeply interested in this case, and those charged with the prosecution realize that they will earn his gratitude if their efforts are successful.

When the Government attempted to take the editors of the Indianapolis *News* to Washington to be tried under a statute which Elihu Root described in the Dana case as "*the same arbitrary and odious law against which Erskine fought in the days of George III,*" Joseph B. Kealing, United States Attorney for Indiana, resigned his office rather than participate in the proceeding, on the ground that—

I believe the principle involved is dangerous, striking at the very foundation of our form of government.

When the case came before Judge Anderson he dismissed the defendants and said in his decision:

To my mind that man has read the history of our institutions to little purpose who does not look with grave apprehension upon the possibility of the success of a proceeding such as this. If the history of liberty means anything, if constitutional guarantees mean anything, this proceeding must fail.

If the prosecuting authorities have the authority to select the tribunal, if there be more than one tribunal to select from; if the Government has that power and can drag citizens from distant States to the capital of the nation, there to be tried, then, as Judge Cooley says, this is a strange result of a Revolution where one of the grievances complained of was the assertion of the right to send parties abroad for trial.

And because Judge Anderson said this, because Judge Anderson refused to prostitute the judicial power in order to help Mr. Roosevelt gratify a desire for personal and political revenge, Mr. Roosevelt brands him as "a crook and a jackass." But Henry L. Stimson, who was Mr. Roosevelt's willing tool in the New York proceedings against *The World*, which Judge Hough likewise dismissed, is nominated for Governor by Mr. Roosevelt as evidence of Mr. Roosevelt's "gratitude."

The independent and courageous Judge is "a crook and a jackass," but the servile prosecutor is "Our Harry."

Mr. Roosevelt's slanderous assault upon Judge Anderson is in the same spirit as his recent attacks upon the United States Supreme Court. It is in the same spirit as his attacks upon other Judges who dared to decide according to law and not according to his personal will. Years before Mr. Roosevelt left the White House the fact was generally understood that any Federal Judge who decided against the Government in a case in which Mr. Roosevelt was interested had forfeited his chance of promotion. The appointing power was held as a club over every Judge of the Circuit and District Courts.

What would be the situation if Mr. Roosevelt ever returned to the White House, with power to appoint Judges, with power to coerce Congress into enacting new laws relating to the interior Federal courts and with power to coerce Congress into granting him legislation under which he could pack the Supreme Court? Is it possible to conceive of a greater threat to American liberty and republican institutions? All the nations of Europe and all the hostile fleets of the world could offer no such menace.

The shadow of Rooseveltism is like the shadow of a great war. While it hangs over the country all other political issues are secondary and there is no place for party lines.

## A QUESTION OF HONOR

[January 6, 1913]

UNLESS the Nation intends to make waste paper of its treaties it cannot refuse to submit to arbitration the Panama Canal dispute with Great Britain. One alter-

native is left; that is, that Congress shall repeal the provisions exempting from the payment of canal tolls American shipping engaged in coastwise trade.

When Mr. Taft signed the Panama Canal act he defended the right of the United States to exempt coastwise shipping. But through Secretary Stimson the Administration has condemned this policy, which "in effect will amount to the payment of national funds to a special industry which does not need such assistance"—in other words, the granting of a subsidy to a law-made monopoly.

Still, Mr. Taft realized that under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty Great Britain has grounds for protesting that her rights are violated by the act. It is to his credit that he has the courage and the honesty to declare that the construction of the treaty should be submitted to arbitration, and that if the opportunity comes before he leaves office the dispute will be submitted to an impartial tribunal. Neither the cant of false patriots nor the bluster of jingoes shakes his faith in the wisdom and urgency of meeting Great Britain on equal terms before a court of arbitration.

The United States has two treaties with Great Britain which are vital in this discussion. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 provides that—

The Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise.

The other treaty declares that we will submit to arbitration any questions growing out of the interpretation of treaties, provided they do not "affect the vital interests, the independence or the honor of the two contracting parties, and do not concern the interests of third parties."

If the United States proposes to repudiate both these pledges at one stroke, it may as well tear up all its treaties. It will have given notice to every nation that its plighted word is of no value. If for the sole benefit of a shipping monopoly it persists in its policy of bad faith at Panama, it will expose itself to the merited scorn of the world. It cannot make treaties and break treaties at convenience and hold its head high among the nations. It cannot dishonor its pledged word and retain its self-respect. No sham patriotism can make of the repudiation of solemn obligations "an American policy" unless "American" is to mean something less and something lower than it has meant in an honorable past.

### THE NATION'S PLEDGE

[March 18, 1914]

THE Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was a convention to define the joint policy of the United States and Great Britain "with reference to any means of communication by ship-canal which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua and either or both the Lake of Nicaragua or Managua to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean."

This Treaty, which was ratified by the Senate May 22, 1850, provided that—

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over said ship-canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect nor maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America.

If the Treaty had stopped there, the United States would have been spared much controversy and vexation; but it did not stop there. In their anxiety to extend the general principles of this Treaty to every possible Isthmian route between the Atlantic and Pacific, and thereby prevent interference on the part of other Governments, the American and British diplomatists included in the convention a further provision that—

The Governments of the United States and Great Britain, having not only desired, in entering into this convention, to accomplish a particular object, but also to establish a general principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to any further practicable communications, whether by canal or railway, across the Isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama.

This Treaty was hailed at the time as a notable victory for American diplomacy. It ended all American misgivings as to the objects of the British policy on the Mosquito Coast, and it was regarded as more favorable to American than to British interest.

The United States was not prepared to build a canal, and it was well satisfied to have any canal that might be built subject to the joint protection of the two English-speaking nations.

After ratification the Treaty went to sleep, and for many years neither the United States nor Great Britain manifested further interest in the subject of a trans-Isthmian canal, except in an academic way.

Finally, de Lesseps appeared upon the scene and the question became acute again. Hayes, who was then President, declared that any canal ought to be under American control and the line of that canal should be considered "a

part of the coast-line of the United States." A House Committee reported a resolution, March 8, 1880, that the United States was entitled to control any Isthmian canal and authorizing the President to terminate any treaty conflicting with that principle. The resolution was called up for the second time March 3, 1881, and failed to pass. Congress thus refused to abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.

Garfield modified Hayes's coast-line 'dictum into an assertion that we did not seek a "peculiar route." Frelinghuysen, who was Arthur's Secretary of State, undertook to put the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty to the test and negotiated a treaty with Nicaragua for the construction of a canal entirely under American control. One of Cleveland's first official acts after he became President in 1885 was to withdraw this Treaty from the Senate.

The Spanish-American war made the canal question a vital issue in American politics, and John Hay, then Secretary of State, undertook to bring about a modification of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty was amended by the Senate, much to Secretary Hay's mortification. A new compromise treaty was then negotiated to "facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by whatever route may be considered expedient," and to "remove any objection which may arise out of the convention of the 19th of April, 1850, commonly known as the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States, without impairing the 'general principle' of neutralization established in Article VIII of that convention."

This Treaty, which was received as another brilliant achievement in American diplomacy, provides that—

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations, observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimina-



tion against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

If ever language was clear, this language is clear. If this clause does not mean what it says, it means nothing. Indeed, the whole history of the treaty relations between the United States and Great Britain in respect to an Isthmian canal goes to prove that such a provision, even though it were as clumsily drawn as this provision is plainly drawn, could not mean anything else. Until the coastwise-shipping monopoly saw a chance to grab a million dollars or so a year at the expense of the National Treasury and of the national honor, nobody ever pretended that it meant anything else.

Mr. Hay is dead and Lord Pauncefote is 'dead'; but Joseph H. Choate, who when American Ambassador to Great Britain helped negotiate the treaty, is still alive. No other living man is so well qualified to give testimony as to the meaning of this provision and this is what Mr. Choate says:

As the lips of both these diplomatists and great patriots, who were true to their own countries and each regardful of the rights of the other are sealed in death, I think that it is proper that I should say what I think both of them if they were here today would say—that the clause in the Panama Toll act exempting coastwise American shipping from the payment of tolls is in direct violation of the treaty.

I venture to say that in the whole course of the negotiations of this particular treaty, no claim, no suggestion, was made that there should be any exemption of anybody.

The whole civilized world is against the United States on this issue. As Senator Lodge says, we are threatened with the stigma of an "outlaw Nation" which has no respect for its solemn word or its solemn pledges. The President of the United States, in urging Congress to

repeal the special Canal privileges granted to the coastwise monopoly, had said:

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the Administration. I shall not know how to deal with matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

In the face of the record of such a solemn appeal, Lewis Nixon writes to *The World*, to say that he has "never seen a sincere or logical argument to uphold the Hay-Pauncefote provision against remission of tolls." Senator O'Gorman, who is helping the coastwise monopoly keep its hand in the National Treasury, has even forgotten that he was once eminent as a Judge, and falls back upon the pettifogging argument that—

The word "vessels" as used in the treaty applies solely to ships in the overseas trade. It does not apply and was never intended to apply to the coastwise trade.

In other words, a vessel is a vessel if it does not get a subsidy, but it is a raft or a derrick or a pike-pole if it does get a subsidy.

The Constitution provides that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be part of "the supreme law of the land." But Congress has recognized a higher law than the supreme law. That higher law is in the pockets of the coastwise-shipping monopoly. In order to give a million dollars a year to men who are already protected against every form of foreign competition, Congress undertakes to violate a treaty and break the pledge of the Nation. The Democratic part of Congress which upholds this tolls exemption is also turning its back upon the fundamental principle of its party and voting special privileges to a special interest at the expense both of the public Treasury and the public faith. And to what pur-

pose? Not to build up an American merchant marine, for not a cent's worth of privilege is given to any American ship in the foreign trade. Every ship flying the American flag which goes through the Panama Canal bound to any foreign port must pay the same toll as a British ship or a German ship or a French ship.

The subsidy is all for the shipping that has no foreign competition. The treaty-breaking is all for a monopoly that has no foreign competition. The honor of the Nation and the historic principles of the Democratic party are alike flouted for the profit of a few coastwise carriers, while 95,000,000 American people are made to pay the bill in money and to pay the bill in international enmity.

The United States built the Canal subject to the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and it is bound by those provisions. There is no external power or tribunal which can compel this country to respect its pledges, but the pledges are as valid as if we were the weakest instead of the strongest of nations.

This country began its national existence by proclaiming in the Declaration of Independence its "decent respect for the opinions of mankind." It must still maintain that decent respect for the opinions of mankind. Whatever Congress may think or whatever Congress may do at the behest of a monopoly's lobby, the American people are a people who want to keep the faith.

### A VINDICATION

[April 24, 1921]

THE ratification of the Colombian treaty by the United States Senate has brought to an official end the most remarkable controversy in the journalistic life of The New York *World* or perhaps of any other American newspaper.

In the Presidential campaign of 1908 certain events of no particular importance in themselves brought the Panama revolution of 1903 back into the news and revived public curiosity as to the inspiration of that revolution, the real ownership of the Panama Canal Company and the part that Theodore Roosevelt had played in the seizure of the Isthmus. The Panama revolution did not become in any sense an issue in the contest, but shortly after election Mr. Roosevelt saw fit to write a characteristic letter assailing the *Indianapolis News*. Mr. Roosevelt's statement of what had taken place in respect to Panama was so recklessly false that *The World* denounced his mendacity and called for a Congressional investigation. Mr. Roosevelt did not want a Congressional investigation or any other kind of investigation, so he hit on a highly ingenious device for smothering it. First he sent an abusive message to Congress personally attacking the late Joseph Pulitzer and accusing him of having "libelled the United States Government," and then he proceeded to invent a Federal libel law under which his charges could be prosecuted.

If Mr. Roosevelt had believed himself libelled in any way the courts of New York were open to him and he himself was a citizen of New York, but Mr. Roosevelt was not interested in bringing a libel suit under the laws of this State. That would have meant trying the case on its merits, and Mr. Roosevelt had no intention of allowing the case to be tried on its merits. The Department of Justice was instructed to proceed under a fantastic construction of a Federal statute drafted originally to punish minor misdemeanors committed on Federal property and not provided for in the Federal statutes. The indictments were obtained, and the issue was thus shifted from the Panama revolution to the constitutional power of the President to decree a Federal libel law.

The United States Courts made short shrift of Mr.

Roosevelt's suit. Judge Hough threw it out of court; an appeal was finally taken by the Government to the United States Supreme Court and the court of last resort unanimously sustained the lower court. That ended the legal proceedings, but there had been no trial of the issues of fact.

*The World* in the mean time had carried on its own investigation of the Panama revolution at great effort and at great expense. The inquiry was carried on in New York, in Paris, in Panama, in Bogota and in Washington, and the accumulated mass of evidence was irresistible in its demonstration that what had taken place in Panama was not a revolution but a most sordid and shameless conspiracy into which Theodore Roosevelt had dragged the United States Government in order to gratify his personal ambition. After Mr. Wilson became President the Democratic Congress that was elected with him made an investigation of the Panama affair, and the evidence collected by *The World* is part of the official record.

After Secretary Bryan had negotiated the treaty with Colombia which a Republican Senate has now ratified, Mr. Roosevelt was vociferous in his denunciation of it, but he never ventured to meet the evidence in the case. Just as he had attempted to invent a Federal libel law, so he undertook to invent a history of the Panama revolution, which had more or less merit as a piece of fiction but which did not square with the established facts.

The Republican Senators prevented the ratification of this treaty during Mr. Wilson's two Administrations, but under an Administration of their own party they have been compelled to ratify it and make reparation for the wrong that Mr. Roosevelt inflicted on a weak and defenseless nation. The most flagrant act of Prussianism in the history of the United States is now definitely repudiated by the political party that ardently defended it for nearly eighteen years.

In closing the chapter *The World* can only express its gratification that justice has finally been done and that a stain has been erased from the honor of the United States. *The World* does not construe the Senate's action as a vindication of itself, for it needed no vindication. It long ago proved its case. What has been vindicated is the good name of the United States, and no Senator who voted for the Colombian treaty will ever have occasion to apologize to his conscience for his course.

## CHAPTER II

### THEODORE ROOSEVELT

WHEN Mr. Cobb came to New York to write for *The World* Mr. Roosevelt was President of the United States, and he continued to hold that office through four years that would be called tumultuous but for the greater tumult that presently broke out in the World War. The President's acts and policies were the subject of frequent discussion and occasional attack during the dozen years that elapsed before his death. In those years *The World* often spoke of Mr. Roosevelt in hearty praise; often, also, it clashed with him. The story of the most famous encounter between two strong characters, the Panama controversy and libel suit, has already been told.

#### MR. ROOSEVELT'S GREATEST TRIUMPH

[August 30, 1905]

IN effecting an agreement between Japan and Russia President Roosevelt has won a splendid victory. His part as peace-maker at Portsmouth is the crowning achievement of his brilliant career. It promises to stand recorded as the most notable work of a crowded political life. History cherishes few spectacles so extraordinary as his summoning Japan and Russia from the bloody battle-field of Manchuria and bringing them face to face in the quiet Portsmouth conference hall to settle their savage quarrel.

Every American, whether he be Democrat or Republican, has just reason for pride and patriotism in Mr. Roosevelt's triumph over tremendous obstacles. Full credit is his for his unprecedented audacity, for his deliberate courage in stepping in between the warring nations. He had the sagacity to seize the psychological moment and the persistence to press his point home. If he had observed the usual diplomatic caution the deadlock of ten days ago would surely have terminated in open rupture. He set aside the conventions and went straight to St. Petersburg and Tokio with his plea for peace.

But for all his personal force and perseverance he would have been impotent if he had not had behind him the moral power and prestige of the nation of which, in the eyes of the world, and especially of Japan, he is the highest representative.

Not less praise belongs to Japan for her magnanimity and noble self-sacrifice. She has surrendered her self-interest and her just demands in the interests of humanity and peace. She has not only abandoned legitimate claims, but has yielded up territory which by the laws of war she was entitled to keep. It would have been better in the long run if her demand for an indemnity had been enforced. The establishment of the principle that a defeated nation must pay a large indemnity would have been of incalculable benefit as a deterrent of possible wars in the future. Peace and humanity might have been safeguarded and more bloodshed avoided. Nothing more wholesome could be imagined than the absolute confirmation of the indemnity principle which Bismarck introduced, though for radically different reasons.

We also firmly believe that the Russian people would have come into a fuller measure of liberty and justice if Japan had refused to abandon her demands and had continued the war and taken Vladivostok, to the utter humiliation of the autocracy. The Czar gives only what he



must in order to preserve his own throne. In exposing his real weakness, Japan has already helped the Russian masses toward understanding of their capacity to attain their rights when occasion arises. By turning the Czar's defeat into disaster Japan would have made his loss his subjects' gain. But Japan had to consider the fact that to continue the war meant the expenditure of \$1,000,000 a day—a terrible fact, as her own Ambassador has said, even at the end of a victorious campaign.

At first sight it may seem that Russia has gained a moral victory in that she carries her point in refusing to pay an indemnity. But when second sober thought sets in; when the treaty of peace has been actually signed and delivered, has become a part of the law of nations, part of the actual obligations of Russia and part of the conceded rights of Japan; when we see as accomplished facts Port Arthur in the hands of the Japanese, Corea and Manchuria surrendered by Russia, and the more valuable half of Saghalien and the southern line of the Chinese Eastern Railroad turned over to the Japanese, it must be plain that these facts carry with them the entire renunciation of Russia's policy in the Far East and an abandonment of her program of expansion toward the Pacific.

Japan has not only wrested from Russia her one ice-free harbor and its fortifications and destroyed her navy. In keeping for herself the southern portion of Saghalien she retains certain control of all the straits by which Vladivostok can be reached and renders it useless at all seasons as a naval port. In no way could she have limited Russia's naval power in the Pacific more effectively. Moreover, she has just renewed her treaty of alliance with England. Russia will be made to abide scrupulously by the terms of her agreement. The evacuation of Manchuria this time will be honestly executed and China's debt to Japan will be made permanent.

The Treaty cannot mean anything but humiliation and

defeat for Russia and triumph for Japan. Russia will be driven out of China for a century to come. Her prestige in the Far East is gone and Japan is in the ascendant, her national security accomplished and her station among the great Powers of the world recognized.

As the result of the peace of Portsmouth the United States beyond a doubt stands higher today in the estimation of the world than ever before. In the person of President Roosevelt this nation has held the scale evenly balanced between Japan and Russia, has resolutely kept them to the work, and in spite of jealousy and bitterness has made their reconciliation a durable benefit to the world. Mr. Roosevelt gains immensely thereby in renown and popularity. When the time comes for further honors, he will be almost invincible. Whether he sought it or not, by this last act he has fixed himself more firmly in the popular regard. The opposition was already broken and disorganized. He has swept it away. What he now protests that he will not seek or accept he will find himself forced to take if it is thrust upon him by the overwhelming sentiment of the country.

## MORE MUDDLING OF GOVERNMENT

[August 21, 1907]

I BELIEVE in a national incorporation law for corporations engaged in interstate commerce. I believe, furthermore, that the need for action is most pressing as regards those corporations which, because they are common carriers, exercise a quasi-public function, and which can be completely controlled in all respects by the Federal Government by the exercise of the power conferred under the interstate commerce clause, and if necessary under the post-road clause of the Constitution.—*From President Roosevelt's Provincetown speech.*

Always more law, more law, like the daughters of the horse-leech crying "Give! Give!" When will the Presi-

'dent's clamor for new legislation end? When will he give the legitimate business interests of the country a breathing spell?

The grave defect of Mr. Roosevelt's corporation policy is that he has no policy. He has advocated a constitutional amendment to enable the Government to suppress the trusts; he has advocated publicity as the first essential step in controlling these corporations and secured the agencies of such publicity; he has promised the strictest enforcement of the Sherman law; he has explained why "good" trusts should not be prosecuted at all; he has advocated Federal licenses for all corporations engaged in interstate commerce; he has undertaken to have receivers appointed for corporations that violate the law; he has advanced the astounding doctrine that under the post-roads clause Congress can control any common carrier that transports the mails; he has demanded and obtained the power through a commission to fix railway rates; he has declared that no criminal, high or low, whom the Government could convict would escape punishment; he has explained why the criminal prosecution of these criminals is generally inexpedient—and now he has arrived at a Federal incorporation law as the sovereign remedy.

Mr. Roosevelt prosecutes a few big corporations, and a dozen State Governors set up in business as uncompromising trust-busters. Mr. Roosevelt gains a Federal rate bill through Congress, and twenty State Legislatures, bereaved of passes and free transportation, begin to regulate railroads. Their powers had lain dormant for years; their duties had been neglected with solemn and studied care, but under the inspiration of Mr. Roosevelt's success and Mr. Bryan's applause a frenzy for regulation runs from one end of the country to the other. In only one of these twenty States, New York, is any of this regulation shaped along the lines of rational intelligent statesmanship.

To make confusion worse confounded a sharp conflict of authority has arisen between State authorities and Federal courts in half a dozen States. Judge Jones, of the United States District, has enjoined the authorities of Alabama, including every sheriff and every solicitor, from enforcing the new rate law against the Louisville and Nashville Railroad until its validity can be determined. In the same State the Southern Railroad surrendered to the authorities because it feared to conduct its case in the Federal courts on account of a bitterly hostile local sentiment. In North Carolina it made a similar surrender for the same reasons, and the Governor of North Carolina, in an outburst of patriotism, explains that while he would have called out the militia to enforce the decree of State courts against Federal courts, he would not have ordered his State troops to fire on Federal troops.

More legislation has been passed in a single year than the courts can dispose of in the next three years. Of this mass of railroad legislation not a single act has yet been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. The validity of even the national rate law is yet to be determined, and Secretary Taft admitted in his speech Monday that the United States Supreme Court has never decided the question whether Congress could delegate to a commission its power to fix rates.

From every economic point of view the situation of the railroads is perplexing, if not precarious. The National Government and forty-five State governments are seemingly set on doing the same thing in the same way. Any railroad long enough to cross a State border is subject to from three to twenty different regulations and regulators. Not content with supplying the deficiencies of Federal regulations, the States are trying to exercise co-equal and co-ordinate powers, thus creating forty-six different masters for the railroad interests as a whole to serve.

Whatever crimes railroad manipulators have committed in the past, whatever stupidities their present management may be guilty of, the roads cannot be subject to forty-six kinds of rates and forty-six different masters and survive. They would be ground into bankruptcy between the upper and nether millstones of State and Federal authority, to the lasting injury of every wage-worker, to the semi-paralysis of all business and appalling damage to all honest industries.

It is double folly to invent new schemes of regulation and excite new unrest when acts already passed are yet to be worked out in practice and tried out in the courts. Never before in the history of the country has so much actual administration been crowded upon the courts, and especially the United States courts. Never before has the Supreme Court been called upon to grapple with so many radical and fundamental questions involving the control of property and business. More and more the power of government is drifting into the hands of the judiciary to create general suspense and uncertainty, for the machinery of the courts moves slowly, while the machinery of legislation is revolving at the highest speed.

Is it surprising that the business interests of the country are stunned and bewildered, or that the whole financial fabric is twisted and tangled?

Nothing is settled. Nothing is certain. The demand for new experimental legislation goes on before the older experimental legislation has been tried and tested. Confidence is shaken, and confidence is the mother of credit. Credit is weakened, and without credit the business of the country cannot be carried on. This is a simple fact which is worth a pound of all the theories that even so versatile a genius as President Roosevelt can invent.

Although New York is the richest city in the world, the municipal government cannot obtain money to carry on needed improvements or pay contractors in full for

work already done. Neither at public nor private sale has the Comptroller been able to dispose of bonds already authorized. Other cities, no matter how good their credit, are having equal difficulty in borrowing money. Wall Street declares that railroad bonds cannot be sold on account of Mr. Roosevelt's unwise regulation of railroads and his prosecution of rich offenders.

The courts can enforce justice and prevent injustice, but they cannot decree confidence and credit. Neither can Legislatures legislate confidence and credit. Mr. Roosevelt cannot proclaim confidence and credit. We are not censuring the President for enforcing the anti-trust laws and upholding the power of the Federal Government over interstate commerce. It was time that power was vindicated.

For twenty-four years *The World* has urged the authority of the United States Government to protect the people from the rapacity of trusts, monopolies and great corporations. The Sherman law, which *The World* insistently advocated, was a tremendous triumph for public opinion, but it remained dead until Mr. Roosevelt quickened it into life. Mr. Cleveland regarded it with indifference; Mr. Olney, his Attorney-General, treated it with open contempt. Then came Mr. McKinley, with Mark Hanna brazenly selling to corporations the privilege of violating the law in exchange for campaign contributions. There is no more shameful chapter in American history.

Is it surprising that financiers and trust managers came to regard the Sherman law as a rather 'disreputable joke? If the United States Government showed no respect for its own statute, how could individuals be expected to volunteer such respect? The belief was generally established in financial circles that the anti-trust act was only a convenient 'decree for filling campaign chests, and that the purchase of immunity was a sacred duty which every manager of a great corporation owed to his stockholders.

The United States Government winked at and connived at violations of its own laws, and this fact deserves to be considered in the prosecution of long-past offenses.

The Mr. Roosevelt who is now discouraged by the difficulties of convicting individuals is the same Mr. Roosevelt who never denied that he urged the Governor of Illinois not to prosecute Harriman criminally for the Alton swindle, who had his Cabinet decide against the criminal prosecution of Harriman by the Federal Government, who practically edited down the Interstate Commerce Commission strictures on Harriman's disgraceful operations, and who refused Mr. Kellogg's request to institute criminal proceedings against this arch-manipulator.

Eating his brave words at Indianapolis, he advances virtually the same arguments against criminal prosecutions under the anti-trust law that Mr. Jerome advances for not prosecuting the big life-insurance swindlers. Instead of enforcing the laws he has which have already been declared constitutional, and waiting for the courts to determine the validity of acts not yet tested, Mr. Roosevelt continues to propose new laws and new experiments whose chief effect is to increase business anxiety, further weaken confidence and further impair credit. There is nothing certain about Mr. Roosevelt but uncertainty, and this uncertainty is a heavy burden to that general prosperity which the President did not even deign to discuss in his Provincetown speech.

Right as Mr. Roosevelt is on the main issue, right as he is on the question of income and inheritance taxes, his lack of judgment, his passion for new schemes, his absence of a consistent policy and his disposition to play politics at all times and in all places constitute a blight upon credit and confidence.

In the long run business can probably adjust itself to any reasonable conditions, but it must know what those

conditions are. It cannot leave them to chance, or whim, or personal ambition, or restlessness of temperament, or even to the supernal discretion of little fatherhood.

The Roman augurs used to determine from the entrails of a fowl the temper and intentions of the gods. But where is the augur, the fowl or the entrails from which the temper and intentions of Theodore Roosevelt could be determined?

Therein lies Mr. Roosevelt's great offense against general prosperity. He has muddled government and messed the orderly administration of things. It is time to call a halt. It is time to give legitimate business a breathing spell and permit the restoration of confidence and credit.

The country needs a rest from agitation.

#### FOR SENATOR—ROOSEVELT!

[November 9, 1908]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT should succeed Thomas C. Platt as United States Senator from New York.

*The World* would infinitely prefer a Democrat of proved ability, integrity and character, but no Democrat can be elected. The Legislature is Republican; Platt's successor will be a Republican, and the choice narrows to the Republican best qualified to represent the State of New York. That man, in our opinion, is Theodore Roosevelt.

In suggesting Mr. Roosevelt for the Senatorship *The World* withdraws no word or syllable of the criticism which it has made of his Administration, of his policies, of his methods and of the manner in which he has discharged the duties of his high office. We do not regard Mr. Roosevelt as a fit President. He lacks balance; he



lacks poise; he lacks dignity; he lacks a sense of proportion; he lacks a sense of his responsibilities; he lacks judgment; he lacks nearly all the elements except energy and determination that go to make an administrator of the first rank.

His jingoism; his demagogic tendency to appeal to passion and class hatred; his excessive restlessness; his excessive vanity; his excessive ambition; his impetuous Southern temperament; yes, even his very genius, all help to disqualify him for an office which demands more of the spirit of the judge than the spirit of the crusader.

But Mr. Roosevelt's faults would be far less conspicuous in the Senate than in the White House. In the United States Senate no man is supreme. However energetic, however impulsive, however ambitious, he must conform to the traditions of the greatest deliberative body in the world—the most democratic body in the world—where the power of every member is determined on the one hand by his solitary vote and on the other hand by the skill, tact and ability with which he performs his official functions. He may represent the largest State in the Union or the smallest, the richest or the poorest, but he will neither acquire nor lose influence on that account.

As Senator Mr. Roosevelt would be merely one man among ninety-two; only one member of a body which clings with great tenacity to its rules and its prerogatives, which would no more be dazzled by the presence of Theodore Roosevelt than it would be dazzled by the presence of Andrew Johnson, but which would still provide him the largest measure of opportunity for public service.

Any man who has been President of the United States has gained an experience that is invaluable to the nation and should not be lost. He has a knowledge of foreign relations which is of the utmost importance to the Senate in the consideration of treaties. His familiarity with all the administrative departments makes him a veritable

cyclopedia of information in regard to many questions of legislation. Whether his own policies be good or bad, whether his judgment be sound or weak, his experience in the White House is a great national asset which the American people should have the benefit of.

Moreover, the dignity of the office is shockingly lowered when a President of the United States at the end of his term is thrust into private life to shift for a living for himself and family as best he can. It is not seemly that a Grant should lend his name to a firm of Wall Street gamblers, or that a Cleveland should be compelled to accept a Ryan sinecure, or that a Harrison should have to appear before the United States Supreme Court to argue that a street-railway company's franchises are perpetual.

Much as we respect the profession of journalism, it is not seemly that even so virtuous a periodical as the *Outlook* should be able to capitalize a President's prestige and popularity, and use him to advertise its business four months in advance of his retirement from the White House. The President is the one constitutional officer in the American Government who is the representative of all the people, and after his term has expired, his influence and experience should be retained by the people in the interest of the general welfare. Least of all should he be exploited like a patent liver pill or a new skin soap.

For this reason, as a fundamental question of principle, *The World* has long urged that a retiring President should receive a pension of at least \$25,000 a year and that he should have a seat in the Senate. There is no better way of setting this highly desirable reform in motion than for New York to make Mr. Roosevelt a United States Senator.

In advocating Mr. Roosevelt's election to the Senate *The World* is moved by public considerations. Without doubt we should be compelled to criticise Senator Roosevelt quite as severely as we have ever criticised President

Roosevelt. We should expect to be abused by him quite as viciously and vindictively as he abuses everybody who tells the truth about him. We should expect that as Senator he would continue to manifest some of the worst faults he has shown as Chief Executive; but for all that, the Senate itself would restrain his violence, curb his impetuosity, check his impulsiveness, chain his superabundant energy, and give him the best possible field for exercising his unquestioned talents for the public good.

By all means let the New York Legislature elect Theodore Roosevelt a Senator in the Congress of the United States to succeed Thomas C. Platt. Who else is so well qualified?

### MR. ROOSEVELT'S RETURN

[June 18, 1910]

Men of genius are governed by their instinct; they follow where instinct leads them; and the public life of a nation is but the life of successive generations of statesmen, whose horizon is bounded and who act from day to day as immediate interests suggest.

The popular leader of the hour sees some present difficulty or present opportunity of distinction. He deals with each question as it arises, leaving future consequences to those who are to come after him. The situation changes from period to period, and tendencies are generated with an accelerating force which, when once established, can never be reversed.

When the control of reason is once removed, the catastrophe is no longer distinct, and then nations, like all organized creations, all forms of life, from the meanest flower to the highest human institution, pass through the inevitably recurring stages of growth and transformation and decay. A commonwealth, says Cicero, ought to be immortal and forever renew its youth. Yet commonwealths have proved as unenduring as any other natural object.—From *Froude's "Caesar."*

In one of his lectures before the students of Yale University Elihu Root gave a matchless definition of republican institutions—"Popular government is organized self-control."

Those words deserve to be written in letters of gold over the entrance to every City Hall, over the entrance to every State House, over the entrance to the National Capitol, over the portals of the White House itself—Popular government is organized self-control.

And there appeared also in this same lecture by Mr. Root a warning that no student of history would lightly disregard:

Nevertheless, we must not delude ourselves with the idea that the American experiment in government is ended or that our task is accomplished. Our political system has proved successful under simple conditions. It remains to be seen how it will stand the strain of the vast complications of life upon which we are now entering.

A startling significance is given to Mr. Root's admonition by a paragraph in Rabbi Stephen S. Wise's article on "The Return of Roosevelt," printed in the June number of *North American Review*:

Not very long ago it fell to the writer to discuss the inexhaustible theme of Rooseveltism with two men, one of whom had been in Roosevelt's Cabinet, the other being a Wall street magnate. Each unwittingly indulged in prophecy. His former lieutenant unhesitatingly predicted the re-election of Roosevelt and a subsequent change in the Constitution which would enable him to retain office while he lived. Nor was this spoken in jest, for the speaker was in grim and almost panicky earnest. "But," he added significantly, "Roosevelt will do this not in the interests of his own fortunes, but to save his country."

Whoever he was, the man who advanced this amazing proposal had been Elihu Root's colleague and associate

in the Cabinet. As prophecy we may dismiss as contemptuously as we please his forecast of Mr. Roosevelt's future; but as a reflection of the changing attitude of the American people toward their system of government it merits sober consideration. The day is very recent when a Cabinet officer would seriously suggest that any man be made President of the United States for life, and least of all that any man would become President for life in order "to save his country."

In the darkest hours of the Civil War no member of the Cabinet ever proposed that Abraham Lincoln be made President for life. No member of Grant's Cabinet thought Grant should or would be made President for life. Cleveland was compelled to face a great economic crisis, and the fortunes of an unnecessary war led McKinley into a revolutionary experiment with colonial government; but there was no suggestion that Cleveland or McKinley be made President for life. This curious distinction has been reserved for Theodore Roosevelt at a time when the nation is menaced by no enemies from without and by no enemies from within except those that are common to all civilized countries.

What this former Cabinet officer said to Rabbi Wise thousands of other persons have been saying in cruder and less definite form. There is no better index to the state of the common mind than the universal question, "What is Roosevelt going to do?" Nobody asks what the country is going to do with Roosevelt, but what Roosevelt is going to do with the country.

The theory that in Mr. Roosevelt will be found the source of all political progress has been fostered in a hundred different ways. One of the most widely circulated and influential weekly periodicals of America has been printing a page appeal to its readers to "*Tell Roosevelt.*"

It sets forth that "it is highly desirable that Mr. Roosevelt, as a public leader with large power to affect

the course of events in this nation, should be furnished with correct information upon the state of the political feeling of the country." Accordingly it prints a coupon which its readers are urged to fill out and send to the office of the periodical, which is owned and edited by one of Mr. Roosevelt's intimate personal friends. The "plebiscite" covers nearly every political question before the country, from the voter's attitude toward the Taft Administration to the voter's yearning for Canadian reciprocity, all under the inspiring legend: "*Tell Roosevelt.*"

There are no perplexing questions of principle submitted to Mr. Roosevelt to wrestle with. He is simply to be informed as to what the country wants, under the happy assumption that he will do the rest.

If the people want Cannon, he, Theodore Roosevelt, is to see that they have Cannon. If they want an income tax he will amend the Constitution and give them an income tax. If their political yearnings take the form of postal savings banks he will establish postal savings banks. If they are dissatisfied with Mr. Taft he will make short shrift of Taft. Tell him what the majority wants and it is done.

Even a decade ago such a "plebiscite" would have been greeted with derision. Now it is treated soberly and earnestly, not to say reverently. We have no doubt that thousands of seemingly intelligent American citizens have filled out these coupons in the sincere belief that as soon as Theodore Roosevelt knows their political desires the work of fulfilment will begin. For is it not written that the shepherd guardeth his sheep? Even the Governor of Missouri, the State that Thomas H. Benton represented in the Senate, is frantically calling upon the "first citizen of the world" for "an announcement of the policies of the Republican party which can be adopted by all."

Mayor Gaynor, in a recent article about Mr. Roosevelt's home-coming, referred to that most felicitous defini-

tion of political principle in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 which has been the guiding star of American government for nearly a century and a quarter:

In the government of this commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them; to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men.

Daniel Webster said that the concluding words of this paragraph were the greatest words contained in any written constitutional document. Yet more and more the American people are placing their faith in a government of men and not of laws. Democracy is a weary Titan, tired of its problems and its burdens. It feels the strain of the vast complications of modern life. We are breeding up a generation that has no first-hand knowledge of how much blood and iron have gone into the making of human liberty. Born free, it is impatient of all restraint. It is less jealous of its rights than of its ease. It would rather be governed than govern if it can be governed in its own way. It would rather be ruled than rule if it can be ruled according to its own whims. Its ideals are not "organized self-control," but a species of mob law executed by "the just man armed" who has read the temper of his people.

Find Christian, and he alone will overcome Apollyon. Find Siegfried, and he will slay the dragon. Find Louis Bonaparte, and he will restore the glory of France. Find Theodore Roosevelt, and he if need be will put a hook in the jaws of leviathan. He will bind the influence of the Pleiades. He will guide Arcturus in his course.

This is not self-government, but the negation of self-government. It is not organized self-control, but organ-

ized self-surrender, organized abdication. Superficially King Stork may seem far more desirable than King Log, but sooner or later the frogs discover their mistake, and it is then too late. The blind search for somebody, as Bismarck said, to do for us what we ought to do for ourselves must always lead to disaster.

Frederick Jesup Stimson remarked in one of his Lowell lectures on "The American Constitution" that "the English people, in a thousand years' experience, have found that their liberties were never so really in danger as when they knew it least; never so nearly lost as under the Kings they liked best."

Many of the worst political tendencies that the American people have had to contend with established themselves under Presidents that were the most popular, and every period of hero worship has left its train of new political evils to perplex the nation. Whenever the American people forget that this is "a government of laws, not of men," they have made their problems not more simple of solution but more difficult.

Their effort to deify Mr. Roosevelt does not represent political progress, but political reaction. It is atavism in free government. There is no modern parallel to it since France opened her arms to Louis Napoleon Bonaparte—and unconsciously pointed the way to Sedan and the Downfall. Today it seems incredible that sixty-odd years ago more than 5,000,000 out of 6,500,000 Frenchmen should have voted to make Louis Bonaparte President of France, and still more incredible that less than sixty years ago France by a vote of 7,500,000 to 640,000 should have permitted him to proclaim himself Emperor. Nobody has yet satisfactorily analyzed the psychology of the mob, and it is impossible to set limits to the potential political follies of a people suddenly imbued with the mania for personal government.

Mr. Roosevelt cannot be held personally responsible



for the apotheosis, however much he has done to build up his own myth and establish the popular illusion of a Roosevelt that does not exist, that never existed and never can exist. After all, he is only a private citizen. He holds no office. Not a solitary soldier is under his command; not a policeman; not even a constable. His only power is the power of this Roosevelt legend expressed in popular desire for a political Messiah. And if he does ridiculous things—even dangerous things—we must remember that steadier heads than his have been turned by less adulation than the American people have showered upon him.

Occasionally there arises a great figure that neither applause nor flattery can spoil, but the Washingtons and Lincolns are few in number and appear infrequently upon the stage of action. It would be strange indeed if Theodore Roosevelt thought himself of less importance to civilization than tens of thousands of his fellow-countrymen hysterically proclaim him to be, and it is for their benefit that we repeat Froude's impressive warning, "when the control of reason is once removed the catastrophe is no longer distant." To a Republic the real catastrophe comes when a free people forget what free institutions mean, and not when the ultimate overlord is finally in control.

What Mr. Roosevelt proposes to do must inevitably be interesting, but what the American people propose to do is of vital consequence, for it is they who establish the tendencies that make for progress or disaster. Government of the people, by the people and for the people can never be synonymous with government by hysteria acting through the medium of a superman.

*The World* is not worrying about empire or a sudden downfall of the Republic, regardless of the striking parallel that Ferrero has drawn between America and Rome. The Republic will endure long after all of us are dead. We are not worried about Mr. Roosevelt either, whatever

insidious appeals are made to his vanity and ambition by popular folly. He is not going to be an Emperor, or a King, or a Lord Protector, or even a President for life. This country has not yet arrived at the period of Mexicanization.

What every thoughtful American has reason to be concerned about is not Mr. Roosevelt's plans and purposes, but the average citizen's attitude toward democratic institutions as revealed by his attitude toward Mr. Roosevelt. That is the thing of superlative importance—this new and sinister and un-American passion for personal government. Regardless of Congresses and Courts and Executives and Constitutions, a Republic lives only in the minds of its citizens. It can last, except in form, only so long as their political ideas and ideals are republican in spirit.

## ROOSEVELT AND THE THIRD-TERM TRADITION

[January 2, 1912]

THE WORLD cannot agree with its old friend Henry Watterson that "the third-term tradition is all that stands between us and life tenure in the Presidential office."

The third-term tradition has undoubtedly had its uses; yet we think those uses have been greatly overestimated. The tradition is of less importance than the character of the President upon whom the third term is to be conferred. A third term for Washington or Jefferson or Jackson would not and could not have meant life tenure. Had Lincoln been spared, a third term in his case might have averted the terrible tragedy of reconstruction without diminishing by a single grain the sum total of American liberty.

A nation that is wholly fit for self-government, that

respects its own institutions, that believes in due process of law and is still attached to the basic principles of human freedom, has little to fear from a third term or even a fourth term. Its political salvation is always in its own hands and it remains the strongest guarantee of its own liberties.

The menace of the Roosevelt campaign does not lie in the attack upon the third-term tradition but in the state of mind that could desire four years more of Theodore Roosevelt in the White House—four years more of personal government, four years more of Presidential lawlessness, four years more of autocratic rule, four years more of Executive contempt for Congress, courts and Constitution, four years more of centralization, four years more of jingoism, four years more of wanton extravagance, four years more of denunciation and demagoguery—in the state of mind that wants the New Nationalism, that wants a Little Father, that wants Federal interference with every form of human industry and activity, that wants the States stripped of their powers, that wants the minority deprived of all safeguards against the tyranny of the majority and bureaucracy substituted for the Bill of Rights.

This is a generation that has far too little insight into the meaning of its own institutions. It has forgotten how much blood and iron went into the making of the liberties which it inherited and which cost it nothing. It is a generation impatient of all restraint upon its impulses and its passions. It regards itself as the Fathers and the Prophets. It thinks it has nothing to learn from the past and that the history of the human struggle for freedom carries no lesson to this century. Anything like Constitutions or courts or precedents which stand in the way of its immediate will is regarded as an obstacle to progress.

This sentiment alone is responsible for the recrudescence of Rooseveltism, and this sentiment constitutes the real menace to representative government and repub-

lican institutions. If the American people are determined to have the kind of government that Mr. Roosevelt represents they will get it regardless of third terms. If they do not take him they will find another Roosevelt.

The danger does not lie in popular indifference to the third-term tradition but in popular indifference to the fundamental principles of liberty upon which the Republic was established. If the American people, with all their knowledge of two terms of Roosevelt, want a third term of Roosevelt, they should allow nothing so flimsy as a precedent to stand in their way.

### A CHARTER OF DEMAGOGY

[February 22, 1912]

MR. ROOSEVELT described the speech that he delivered before the Ohio Convention yesterday as "A Charter of Democracy." He should have called it "A Charter of Demagoguery."

The fundamental principle laid down by Mr. Roosevelt was this:

Constitution-makers should make it clear beyond shadow of doubt that the people in their legislative capacity have the power to enact into law any measure they deem necessary for the betterment of social and industrial conditions. The wisdom of framing any particular law of this kind is a proper subject of debate; but the power of the people to enact the law should not be subject to debate. To hold the contrary view is to be false to the cause of the people, to the cause of American democracy.

This is a frank repudiation of the principles upon which American institutions were established. It is another way of saying that the power of the majority ought always to be absolute, and that the minority has no rights

which the majority is bound to respect. It is transplanting to the United States the theory upon which South American Republics have chosen to administer their turbulent affairs. It is Mr. Roosevelt's formal invitation to revolution and anarchy.

According to his scheme of a Constitution, if the majority happens to think it will better "social and industrial conditions" to take away the minority's property without due process of law, it should have that power.

If the majority happens to think it will better "social and industrial conditions" to re-establish human slavery, it should have that power.

If the majority happens to think it will better "social and industrial conditions" to abolish religious freedom, or freedom of speech, or the right of trial by jury when "malefactors of great wealth" are concerned, it should have that power.

If the majority happens to think it will better "social and industrial conditions" to enact *ex post facto* laws, or pass bills of attainder, or suspend the writ of habeas corpus, or tear up the Bill of Rights, it should have the power.

All the experience of human history is to be tossed aside in order that a majority of one may make itself the absolute master of a minority which lacks one. Whoever denies this dictatorship of the majority is "false to the cause of the people, to the cause of American democracy." If such be the case, every American statesman from Washington to Taft—Adams, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Jackson, Clay, Webster, Lincoln, Seward, Cleveland, McKinley—all of them have been false to the cause of American democracy.

To carry out his theory of government, Mr. Roosevelt would not only destroy constitutional guarantees but he would destroy the Constitution as well. Not satisfied with the initiative and referendum and the recall, includ-

ing the recall of Judges, he would submit constitutional questions themselves to popular vote. As he expresses it, "*The decision of a State court on a constitutional question should be subject to revision by the people of the State*":

If any considerable number of the people feel that the decision is in defiance of justice, they should be given the right by petition to bring before the voters at some subsequent election, special or otherwise, as might be decided, and after the fullest opportunity for deliberation and debate, the question whether or not the Judges' interpretation of the Constitution is to be sustained. If it is sustained, well and good. If not, then the popular verdict is to be accepted as final, the decision is to be treated as reversed and the construction of the Constitution definitely decided—subject only to action by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In other words, the majority is to enact the laws through the initiative and referendum, and the majority is to interpret the laws through another initiative and referendum. If a State court undertakes to protect the rights of a minority, if a State court ventures to say that an act of the majority transcends the Constitution or transgresses against human rights and human liberties, the Judge may be recalled, and the decision reversed by the majority which enacted the law.

In these circumstances there would be no State Constitution except from day to day. No man would have any stable guarantee that the majority would respect his rights and no man would know today what his constitutional rights might be tomorrow. Every instrument that makes for stability of government would have been crippled or destroyed. State government would become a matter of mob-rule—a quiet, orderly mob, perhaps, but a mob that was lawless and unrestrained and responsible only to itself for its actions.

We shall pay Mr. Roosevelt the compliment of saying that we do not think he believes a word of the nonsense

that he uttered in his Columbus speech. He is too experienced, he is too well informed, he has been too long a student of government to believe in such folly.

He knows, too, that when he solemnly asserts that "I believe in pure democracy" he professes to believe in something that has been a failure from the dawn of history. Pure democracy has never succeeded in maintaining itself, because pure democracy always carries the germ of pure 'despotism, pure tyranny. No government has a right to live which does not provide means for protecting the weak from the strong, whether this weakness results from want of numbers or want of money or want of brute strength.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech is the harangue of the skilful and unscrupulous agitator to all the elements of political unrest. It is the appeal of the third-term candidate who feels that he must out-demagogue all other demagogues in order to convince the so-called "Progressives" that he alone is the true radical. It is the argument of cunning to ignorance.

We cannot think it will have any influence upon the actions of the Ohio Constitutional Convention, or that it was intended to exert any influence. Mr. Roosevelt's Charter of Demagogism, his adroit attack upon the Sherman Anti-Trust law, his approval of the Gary-Perkins scheme of Government regulation of prices and his veiled assault upon Mr. Taft as one of those "eminent lawyers who more or less frankly 'disbelieve in our entire American system of Government'"—this speech was not to the Columbus Convention but to the Chicago Convention next June.

It is not a treatise on government but a treatise on Theodore Roosevelt—showing, as it does, how far he is willing to travel along the road of demagoguery in order to win another nomination for President.

## "TO THE Y. M. C. A."

[April 25, 1915]

WE are indebted to Mr. Roosevelt for a new theory of the ethics of secret corporation contributions to political campaign funds—indeed, for a new theory of the ethics of secret contributions of all kinds to such funds and to similar funds.

In his testimony at Syracuse, Mr. Roosevelt made it plain that "there was no more connection between business and politics in the contribution of corporations to my campaign in 1904 than in contributions to the Y. M. C. A."

Everybody acquainted with Wall Street knows how easy it is to raise \$3,000,000 for Y. M. C. A. purposes down there between June and November every fourth year. Anybody who knew the late E. H. Harriman can appreciate the enthusiasm with which that gentleman, after a surreptitious visit to the White House at the invitation of a Republican President managing his own campaign, would hustle back to New York to gather an additional \$265,000 to be poured into the Y. M. C. A. a few days before election. Such a person can also understand the honest pride with which Mr. Harriman boasted that by means of this money "at least 50,000 votes were turned in the city of New York alone, making a difference of 100,000 votes in the general result."

These were doubtless Y. M. C. A. votes, but there was "no connection between business and politics" when Mr. Harriman "turned" them after his visit to Mr. Roosevelt. Men like Mr. Harriman never recognize a connection between business and politics, and it is proper for everybody to contribute to a Roosevelt Y. M. C. A. campaign fund, except the Standard Oil Company, which



is barred by strict orders to Cortelyou, which some careless subordinate fails to enforce.

We know now that in the glad old days when the saloon-keepers, the gamblers and the dive-keepers poured their campaign contributions into the coffers of Tammany Hall they were giving money to the Y. M. C. A. We know, too, that when the casual street-walker on Sixth Avenue slipped a \$5 bill into the hand of the plain-clothes man she was giving it to the Y. M. C. A. Presumably the plain-clothes man appreciated the spirit of it as much as he appreciated the spirit of the larger contribution from the Raines law hotel-keeper. At least that is the ethical attitude which he should have taken toward it.

It is evident that most of the corrupt practice legislation that has been enacted as a result of the Roosevelt campaign fund scandal in 1904 is wrong in spirit and in purpose. Why should the Government sternly forbid banks and corporations to contribute money to the Y. M. C. A.? Why also should it enforce pitiless publicity in order that such contributions may be detected if they are made? And why, too, should these philanthropic contributions from corporations so suddenly have dwindled after this legislation was enacted?

Little wonder that Mr. Roosevelt was somewhat out of sympathy with Mr. Hughes, who drafted and carried through the first important laws that checked the stream of Wall Street contributions to the political Y. M. C. A. And how Quay and Hanna would have enjoyed the Roosevelt testimony! They were even more successful than Mr. Roosevelt in compelling the corporations to give up to the Y. M. C. A., but lacking "the root of righteousness," they cynically regarded the process as "frying the fat."

## THEODORE ROOSEVELT

[January 7, 1919]

THE unexpected announcement of Mr. Roosevelt's sudden death was a shock to the entire country. Although it had been known for a long time that his physical condition left much to be desired, there was nothing to indicate that he was nearing the end of his extraordinary career, or even that years of still vigorous activity were not before him.

Next to Thomas Jefferson, Theodore Roosevelt was easily the most versatile of American Presidents. Next to Andrew Jackson, he was easily the most dynamic. Of all Presidents he had the most exuberant joy of living and the widest range of unrestrained enthusiasms.

What Mr. Roosevelt's place will be in history time alone can tell. It certainly cannot be fixed with any certainty of accuracy and precision by the generation which shared in all the passions and controversies of the period in which he was one of the towering leaders of political thought and action. It is by no means improbable that the impartial historian of a later day will determine that Mr. Roosevelt's greatest public service was rendered during his first Administration as President when he set out to demonstrate that the Government of the United States was more powerful than any aggregation of capital or than all the aggregations of capital that were united by a common interest to exploit the country.

There was most acute need of this service, and it could have been successfully undertaken only by a Republican of Mr. Roosevelt's affiliations and temperament who could literally choke the reactionary leadership of his party into submission to this vitally essential policy. The United States was probably never nearer to a social revo-

lution than it was when Mr. Roosevelt came to the Presidency. While it is true that he never succeeded in solving the trust problem in either his first or his second term, by his procedure in the Northern Securities case he succeeded in demonstrating that the country had laws under which the multiplication of trusts could be curbed, that the highest court of the Nation would sustain these laws and that the Government of the United States was not at the mercy of Wall Street and organized capital. This having been demonstrated, the trust question came to answer itself under the steady pressure of public opinion.

This service stands out more clearly and more distinctly than anything else that Mr. Roosevelt ever did in a political way, and needs less qualification. That he eventually carried the issue to an impossible extreme, then to abandon it later and make peace with his former antagonists, could only indict him for personal inconsistency without in any way detracting from the political and social importance of the actual achievement.

Personal inconsistency is a characteristic of all successful politicians. Otherwise they could not survive. And Mr. Roosevelt was unquestionably one of the most adroit and successful politicians that American institutions have ever produced. What is more, he was one of those extraordinary politicians who cannot be explained. None of his talent for public affairs was inherited. He was not born to public service like four generations of the Adams family, nor did he seek a political career because it afforded the only available opportunity to advancement. His tastes originally were more historical and literary than political, and his political career was more accidental than calculated; yet as it came about, not half a dozen Americans ever wielded so much out-and-out political influence as he, and fewer still exercised so much power over the political thought and imagination of their generation. In all American history there is no other such sheer tour

de force of political leadership as Mr. Roosevelt's conduct in deliberately wrecking the Republican Party in 1912 because of his quarrel with Mr. Taft and in reuniting it in 1916 when Mr. Hughes, although beaten, received nearly 1,000,000 more votes than any other Republican candidate for President had ever polled.

Much used to be said about the Roosevelt luck, yet most of the Roosevelt luck consisted in an amazing facility for reading public opinion and for translating thought into action. The American people have always admired strong, aggressive leadership. Even when they were opposed to the policies of such leadership, they have retained their liking for the human force that drove ahead regardless of obstacles, and Mr. Roosevelt was always an elemental force. That was the quality that appealed more convincingly than any other to the average man, that and the general belief that however wrong Mr. Roosevelt might be, his intentions were lofty and patriotic. This, coupled with a fascinating personality, an almost infallible instinct for publicity and for doing even commonplace things in the most dramatic manner, gave him a following at the zenith of his career such as no other President has had since Jackson.

Yet the political world of Theodore Roosevelt has almost ceased to exist, in spite of the enormous popularity which he retained. The old issues have been blown to fragments from the mouths of tens of thousands of cannon, and in spite of all the aggressive and virile Americanism that he displayed during the war, it has long been evident that even so acute a politician as Mr. Roosevelt had failed to perceive the new trend of events. As the recognized leader of the opposition to the peace programme of President Wilson, Mr. Roosevelt spoke a language that is no longer understood by the progressive statesmen of a single country that is concerned with the new problems that are now pressing for solution. He

was out of touch with the momentous events that still remain half concealed under the cover of a military censorship. He was still thinking in terms of a world that no longer exists and that can never be put together again in the old way. It is finished, and political leadership here as elsewhere belongs to those who can grasp the full meaning of the most titanic conflict in which mankind has ever engaged.

Mr. Roosevelt never quite understood it. He saw only its military aspects, and he had acquired so strongly the habit of opposition during the years since he left the White House that he had lost his facility in construction. He had become a critic rather than a builder, and when that inevitable stage is reached in the life of a political leader his work is finished. In Mr. Roosevelt's case that work extended over a period of nearly forty years, and they were years of the most extraordinary and diversified activity of any man of his time.

### CHAPTER III

## THE CHANGING SCENE

NO articles written by Mr. Cobb during his editorship displayed more power or were read with more eager interest than those in which he discussed profound changes in the methods and manner of the Government of the United States. Before the Great War much was said, and much was to be said, about the encroachments of Federal power upon the functions traditionally or constitutionally reserved to the States. An impetuous Executive, Mr. Roosevelt did not a little to hasten this change. After the War, besides the more temporary effect of the contest in abridging freedom of speech and press, a new tendency of constitutional philosophy developed; and Mr. Cobb was one of the earliest commentators to inquire why none of the brand-new governments of Europe, and none of the re-constituted systems of older Powers, followed the framework of our Constitution, as South American Republics had so generally done in an earlier time.

### ABOLISHING THE STATES

[May 31, 1907]

TODAY I wish to say a word to you about the first and most important feature of this task, the control of common carriers doing an interstate business; a control absolutely vested in the nation, while in so far as the common carriers can transport the mails it is in my opinion probable that *whether*

*their business is or is not interstate it is to the same extent subject to Federal control under the clause of the Constitution granting to the National Government power to establish post-roads, and therefore, by necessary implication, power to take all action necessary in order to keep them at the highest point of efficiency.—From President Roosevelt's Memorial Day Address at Indianapolis.*

This is the most radical, far-reaching claim of Federal power advanced by any President of the United States. "We seek nothing revolutionary," says Mr. Roosevelt, the while he proceeds to elaborate the most revolutionary proposition ever put forward by a Chief Executive of the Nation.

If his contention be admitted, no city can control its own public streets. These thoroughfares are used by mail-carriers and mail wagons, and the power of regulation rests in the Congress of the United States. No State can control its own wagon roads if these roads are used by rural free delivery carriers. No city can regulate its own traction companies. These companies in New York City and in many other places carry United States mail. Where they do not, all that is necessary to take them out of the hands of the local authorities and put them in the hands of the Federal Government is a petty mail contract executed between the corporation and the Post Office Department. Likewise, no State can regulate its own electric or steam railroads, for they too carry mail, and Congress has power "to take all action necessary in order to keep them at the highest post of efficiency."

Under the Constitution as interpreted by Mr. Roosevelt the Public Utilities bill is a piece of State impertinence which usurps the functions of the National Government. The various statutes of other States regulating freight and passenger rates are likewise encroachments on the power of Congress. The cities that have been battling for restricted franchises and lower rates of fare have fought in

vain. It is for Congress to prescribe the terms and conditions under which street cars shall be operated upon the public streets, provided the companies also transport the mails.

*The World* takes it for granted that Mr. Roosevelt does not dream of such an extension of the Federal power, but where does he propose to draw the line? Once the claim is admitted that Congress under the power to establish post-roads can regulate commerce and common carriers within a State, then the States are at once stripped of authority over their own roads, their own streets, their own street cars, their own railroads and all other means of transportation.

This is an immeasurably greater power than the President demands even when he insists that the Federal Government shall exercise as complete supervision over railroads as over national banks; for the Federal Government in controlling national banks does not undertake to control State banks, savings banks, private banks or trust companies.

Mr. Root in his speech before the Pennsylvania Society warned the States that they could preserve their authority only by a vigorous exercise of their powers for the general public good. But there is no salvation by good works in Mr. Roosevelt's scheme of theology. Under the clause empowering Congress to establish post-roads the States were predestined to be extinguished, and that's the end of it.

If this interpretation of the Constitution be correct, then the States are indeed lagging superfluous on the scene. Their mission is ended, and the sooner they go out of business the better. But is the Constitution of Theodore Roosevelt the Constitution as known and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States?



## TRUE DEMOCRACY

[June 28, 1907]

WRITING to *The World* from Southern Pines, N. C., on the question "What is a Democrat?" George H. Lacey says:

I note your period of limitation to the year 1907 and infer from that your conception of the policies of the party in power and the public utterances of President Roosevelt to be essentially Democratic in principle and in purpose, and that through the logic of events the Republican party has so far absorbed the leaven of Democracy as to leave no ground for separate and individual party action. But is this true?

We think it is not true. *The World* has neither said it nor believes it. Mr. Roosevelt has carried out many measures which *The World* approves, but he is not a Democrat and the Republican party is not Democratic. Neither in the smallest degree has rendered a militant, truly Democratic party superfluous.

A Democrat who is a Democrat from principle fears too much government rather than too little government. He knows that the human struggle for liberty is an unending effort to strike off the shackles forged by authority and *Privilege*.

This makes him—

1. Opposed to all undue interference with personal liberty.

2. An advocate of home rule.

3. A defender of State rights.

4. An opponent of *Centralization*—not a promoter of further Centralization, like Mr. Bryan, who surpasses Mr. Roosevelt.

5. An enemy of all socialistic and semi-socialistic policies.

6. A believer in a government of checks and balances as against a government by passion and prejudice.

A Democrat who is a Democrat from principle is opposed to all special privileges conferred by government.

This makes him—

1. Opposed to high protective tariffs which enrich the manufacturer at the expense of the consumer. For more than a generation a majority of Democrats have leaned toward free trade, while the Republicans have revised the tariff upward.

2. A believer in the largest possible freedom for the natural person, but in all necessary supervision and control of the artificial person—that is, the corporation.

3. An uncompromising enemy of all trusts in restraint of trade.

4. An advocate of such franchise, income and inheritance taxes as will compel Privilege, Plutocracy and Protection to pay their full share of the cost of a government which makes their existence possible.

A Democrat who is a Democrat from principle instinctively sympathizes with “the under dog.”

This makes him—

1. Partial to measures that encourage the poor to improve their conditions.

2. A believer in universal education at public expense.

3. An opponent of militarism, imperialism, jingoism and the arbitrary rule of alien races against their will.

4. Against public oppression of a corporation no less than against corporation oppression of the public.

5. Sympathetic with labor, but as firmly set against socialism and predatory poverty as against predatory plutocracy.

*A true Democrat who is a Democrat from principle deplores every appeal to class hatred and class prejudice.*

*as a menace to republican institutions. To array masses against classes, employed against employer, poor against rich, labor against capital, is a denial of the whole theory of democracy upon which Jefferson founded the Democratic party.*

*There is no surer or simpler way of overthrowing republican institutions than by stimulating class hatreds and inciting class wars.*

So much for what a true Democrat is and for what true Democracy is.

Let us admit that party lines at present are tangled, twisted and intertwined. Republicans are applauding policies they denounced as crazy ten years ago. Democrats are trying to outbid Republicans in the auction of the anti-corporation vote. But the fact remains that in spite of plutocrats who call themselves Democrats and demagogues who call themselves Democrats there are certain well-settled Democratic principles and tendencies which will assert themselves in the long run and which are necessary to maintain the equilibrium of the Republic.

If the Democratic party were to be exterminated by a socialistic or a semi-socialistic party the character of the American Government would be revolutionized within a quarter of a century.

If the Republican party were to continue as it is under Mr. Roosevelt, while the Democratic party became what Mr. Bryan wishes to make it, all the essential powers of government at Washington would pass ultimately into the hands of the President. Instead of three co-ordinate branches there would be one supreme head—an elective Little Father.

If the Republican party were to continue its Rooseveltian traditions, while the Democratic party became what Mr. Hearst wishes to make it, we should, soon or late, see a desperate minority appealing to blood and iron for the rights a ruthless majority tramples under foot.

If the rights, liberties, activities and opportunities of the individual, as distinct from the mass, are to be preserved, it must come through the enforcement of the true Democratic principles that *The World* has enumerated. Should those safeguards ever be beaten down we may have a government that is republican in form but it will no longer be republican in spirit.

The Democratic party is necessary.

This is not the first time Democrats have 'despaired of the party's future. In 1872, thirty-five years ago, the Democrats nominated for President a bitter anti-Democrat who was a Republican, a protectionist, a prohibitionist and a socialist.

Horace Greeley's 'defeat was a rout—overwhelming and unparalleled. Seemingly the Democratic party was destroyed, annihilated, exterminated. But at the very next election, only four years later, this annihilated, exterminated Democratic party arose from the dead, elected Samuel J. Tilden President on the face of the returns and had a popular plurality of 250,000 to spare.

Who knows what the next sixteen months may bring forth? What if the Democratic party should purify its organization? What if the party should return to its true principles? What if Mr. Bryan, content with his undisputed laurels as chief orator of the party and its greatest agitator of the masses, were to make the personal sacrifice of declining the Presidential nomination in favor of such a man as Judge Gray, for example?

Nothing can crush the Democratic party but itself. Nothing can destroy the Democratic party but its own refusal to be Democratic. Let it return to its true principles. Let it clean its own house. Let it get rid of its Taggarts, its Murphys, its Connerses, its Gradys and its McCarrens; of its Ryans, its Belmonts, its Tony Bradys. Let it be Democratic not merely in name but in faith.

Who would then dare to say that the Democratic

party had finished its course? Who would then 'dare in any and all circumstances to predict a Republican walk-over?

## THE TWILIGHT OF THE GODS—I

[December 6, 1909]

NOT since Cleveland's second administration have party lines at Washington been so broken as they are to-day when the Sixty-first Congress meets for its first regular session.

Democrats and Republicans alike are divided. In the House, Speaker Cannon faces an insurgent revolt; but Champ Clark, the Opposition leader, cannot command the unanimous support of the Democratic Representatives. Senator Culberson has resigned the thankless task of leading the Democratic minority in the Senate, and Senator Aldrich finds his own leadership sharply challenged by radical Senators from the West. Republican Senators and Representatives can be found who are no less radical than Mr. Bryan and Mr. Clark, and there are Democratic Senators and Representatives who are no less conservative than Mr. Aldrich and Mr. Cannon.

Party demoralization in Congress is no accident. It is the inevitable result of a political discontent that is struggling to find a voice. Mr. Bryan expressed it in a way; Mr. Roosevelt expressed it in a way; but neither of them ever got to the heart of things. Neither of them ever succeeded in framing a clear-cut definition of the issue or in demonstrating his capacity for true leadership. Each has been a political opportunist who capitalized popular unrest for his own political profit without looking very far beyond his own immediate advantage.

As *The World* sees it, to find the genesis of this present-day discontent we must go back nearly twenty years,

when public opinion, inflamed by the aggressions of great combinations of capital, compelled the enactment of the Sherman Anti-Trust law. But no law is self-enforcing, least of all one that strikes at privilege and plutocracy. Before sufficient pressure could be brought to bear upon the Executive to compel a vigorous enforcement of the Anti-Trust act the silver question had become acute. This issue was eagerly seized upon by all the forces of political unrest. Attention was diverted from the trusts, and the Sherman law was temporarily forgotten in the struggle to save the nation from the consequences of free silver.

Not until the country had begun to recover from the effects of the financial debauch which followed the election of 1896 and the war with Spain was public interest again aroused as to the importance of the Anti-Trust law. In the meantime the great corporations had intrenched themselves. They had had practically a free hand for more than twelve years and their grip was immeasurably more powerful than it was when the Sherman act was passed.

Since the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case the Government has been scrupulously careful not to "run amuck." There has been a spasmodic enforcement of the law, coupled with Presidential messages to prove that the law could not be enforced, and that if it were enforced the business of the country could not be carried on. There has been no consistent, vigorous, continuing policy of upholding the law.

The public fails to perceive that any decisive victory has been won against the trusts and corporations. In spite of court decisions, trusts continue to do a very profitable business. In spite of laws to regulate freight rates, freight rates have increased rather than diminished. The tariff is revised ostensibly for the benefit of the consumer, but the cost of living steadily increases. Wall Street continues to exploit the people. The country is prosperous

again after the Roosevelt panic, but prosperity has served only to intensify political dissatisfaction.

Sometimes this unrest shows itself in an uprising against the political boss. Sometimes by appeals for semi-socialistic legislation to curb Wall Street and control great corporations. Sometimes in a great movement for the conservation of national resources in order to keep them out of the hands of the exploiter. Sometimes in the demand for further revision of the tariff, or in the insurgent movement against reactionary political leaders like Mr. Cannon and Mr. Aldrich. All this storm and stress is mirrored in the clash of opposing forces in the Sixty-first Congress.

What the country most needs politically is a new alignment of parties, in order that they may again represent the principles and ideals of their members; but this is too much to hope for at present. There are thousands of Republicans who are really Democrats, and thousands of Democrats who are really Republicans; but they are held to their ancient party allegiance by habit, sentiment, tradition and prejudice. Instead of seeking a party that better expresses their views, they are seeking to mould their own party over to their changing principles, and the growing spirit of independence makes the issues only the more confusing.

This is the situation that confronts party leadership everywhere, in Congress and out of Congress. The leaders that try to shut their eyes to it must take the consequences of their own folly and stupidity. This is no struggle of opposing organizations. Democrat against Republican, but a radical movement common to both parties.

The old battle-cries fall on deaf ears. The old standards arouse little enthusiasm. The old prophecies excite no reverence. A new order is seeking to establish itself politically. This is the twilight of the gods.

## THE TWILIGHT OF THE GODS—2

[December 17, 1909]

DISCUSSING *The World's* editorial "The Twilight of the Gods," which he describes as "a picture of contemporary American politics remarkable for insight and historical perspective," Mark Sullivan writes in *Collier's Weekly*:

*The World* stops with depicting the chaos and the twilight. We believe that through the fog a few definite facts are recognizable.

1. One hopeful constructive tendency that is visible is the gradual congealing of the spirit called insurgent into a definite movement.

2. Intangible though it be, and unformulated yet, a general principle underlies the breach between insurgent and stand-patter. The stand-patter frankly and sincerely stands for the protection and development of the big business interests, believing that if it be assured that big business shall prosper, somehow in the running the people will be taken care of. The insurgents believe in legislating for the welfare of the people, believing that business can perfectly well adjust itself to that programme.

All the legislation that may be discussed in Congress this winter will be minor in interest and importance compared to the gradual clearing away of the chaos and twilight which *The World* depicts, and the slow formation of definite political alignments.

There is seldom more than one vital issue in American politics—government for Privilege *versus* government for the People. That is the beginning and end of the trust question, of the tariff question, of the financial question, of the conservation question, of the boss question.

From time to time there is a national awakening to this fundamental fact and a great political revolt follows.



Such a revolt made Jefferson President and destroyed the Federalist party. Another such revolt made Jackson President and destroyed the United States bank. Another made Lincoln President and destroyed the institution of human slavery. The Insurgent movement is only one manifestation of a popular revolt against newer forms of Privilege, which has been striving for many years to find adequate expression. It is part of the protest of a public that is tired of being exploited for private profit.

The radical movement has been gaining strength rapidly of late because the American people are now beginning to feel the pinch of Privilege in the increased cost of living. What was once an abstract question is becoming concrete. They can translate it into dollars and cents. They have discovered that the full dinner-pail has a false bottom and does not hold what it pretends to hold. The old platitudes about prosperity which were so convincing a few years ago are now scoffed at. Wall Street financiers and corporation politicians may prattle about prosperity as much as they please, but the public is beginning to ask embarrassing questions about the division of prosperity. Who is grabbing the lion's share of it, the people or the privileged interests?

The fact is significant that radicalism is no longer sectional and is no longer identified with economic vagaries like greenbackism, populism and free silver. It is getting down to first principles and seeking an intelligent foundation. Eminently respectable persons can be found even in New York who have occasional misgivings as to whether Wall Street is the sole custodian of the national honor and the sole fountain of national prosperity. Party lines are breaking down because popular sentiment is approaching nearer and nearer to unanimity on this question of restraining Privilege and curbing Plutocracy. In that sense most of us are Insurgents. The one distinct issue left is which party can better be trusted to do the work.

## A NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

[November 19, 1910]

NOT in Tilden's time or in Cleveland's time was the Democratic party so united as it is now.

Never before since the Civil War has there been so general an agreement about leaders and issues and opportunities.

We are almost prepared to say that for the first time in fifty years there is a coherent Democratic party which is sobered by victory and responsibility.

Even six months ago Democratic victory seemed to promise nothing better than Republican defeat and a popular rebuke of the party in power. But out of the welter of the campaign has come a new order of things. A new generation of leaders springs into being—Wilson of New Jersey, Dix of New York, Harmon of Ohio, Baldwin of Connecticut, Foss of Massachusetts, Plaisted of Maine. With them must be included Mayor Gaynor, who has pointed the way to the regeneration of municipal government.

These men are not mushroom agitators or political accidents. They belong to the breed of leaders whom men of intelligence can follow. They have already given to the Democratic party new standing, new stability and new character. That they should all have appeared on the scene simultaneously is another proof of the genius of American institutions to produce leadership when leadership becomes imperative.

The way to the complete rehabilitation of the Democratic party is now so simple that it can be lost only by blind stupidity and folly. The trail is so plainly blazed that there can be no excuse for losing it. A Democratic Senator in Maine who represents what Plaisted repre-

sents; a Democratic Senator in New York who represents what Gaynor and Dix represent; a Democratic Senator in New Jersey who represents what Wilson represents; a Democratic Senator in Ohio who represents what Harmon represents; Democratic leadership in Congress that is sane, progressive and cautious—and the work of making a new Democratic party is done.

For the first time since Andrew Jackson's Administration the Democratic party is emancipated and master of its own destiny. All the shackles have been struck off. There is no load of sectional issues or dead issues or economic fallacies for it to struggle under. As secession followed slavery to the grave and silver followed secession, so the Bryan socialism has followed silver, and the Democratic slate is wiped clean. The party is back to first principles again, under leadership that is fit to lead.

For fifty years the greatest service of the Democracy has been that of a party of Opposition. At last the opportunity has come, under men like Wilson and Gaynor and Baldwin and Dix and Harmon and Foss and Plaisted, for it to be a party of constructive and progressive statesmanship.

Four years ago *The World* raised the question, "Shall the Democratic party die?" There is no mistaking the answer of the November elections.

## DEMOCRACY—OR DESPOTISM

[November 2, 1912]

THERE are two systems of government known to modern civilization. One is based on Roman law, the other is based on English law.

Under Roman law the citizen exists for the benefit of the state. Under English law the State exists for the

benefit of the citizen. Under Roman law the affairs of the people are an active concern of government. Under English law the affairs of government are an active concern of the people. Roman law is an institution of imperialism. English law is an institution of democracy.

The best modern example of government under Roman law is Prussia. The best modern example of government under English law is the United States. These two conflicting systems cannot be permanently reconciled.

Twenty years ago, thirty years ago, it would have seemed unbelievable that the issue of Roman law versus English law could ever be presented to the American people in a Presidential election. It would have seemed impossible that the American people would ever give serious consideration to the question of turning to Prussia for a model of government. Yet that is precisely what has happened in the campaign of 1912.

The whole Third-Term programme of government, so far as it departs from the Democratic programme and the regular Republican programme, is grounded in the Roman law and in Prussian theories of paternalism.

Under the Prussian form of government all the activities of the citizen are regulated by an all-wise and all-powerful bureaucracy. At every step of his life a highly centralized Government tells him what he may do, what he must do and what he must not do. By the agency of its tariffs and its subsidies the Government decides what industries it will encourage and what industries it will discourage. By means of its cartels it opens or closes the gates of opportunity at will. Production and consumption are alike regulated by its decrees. Competition or monopoly hinges upon the word of the bureaucrat. The Government guarantees the manufacturer his profit and it tells the consumer what he shall contribute toward the enrichment of industry.

Its peasants are supposed to remain peasants and till

the soil dutifully for the landlord classes that own the estates. Its workmen are supposed to remain workmen and assist the employer in conquering the markets of the world. In return for this docile obedience there are certain compensations such as State insurance and old-age pensions which are intended to reconcile the toiler to his caste. It is not for him to have ambition beyond the ambition to do whatever the Government deems for the best interest of the State. And the poor of Berlin are now killing and eating dogs because a benevolent despotism refuses to modify the prohibitive tariff duties on food.

Above all labor and industry is a ruling class that has rights and privileges unknown to English law. For the citizen who has been wronged by an agent of government there is no redress. The bureaucrat acts in the name of the Government, the Government is supreme, and therefore the bureaucrat is supreme, shielded by a great body of privileged law.

This is diametrically opposite to the theory of the English law that there is nobody so high as to be above the law, and that no authority known to government may trespass upon the rights and liberties of even the humblest citizen. This noble principle was never more clearly illuminated than in Pitt's magnificent outburst of eloquence:

The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the forces of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter—but *the King of England may not enter*. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

As exemplified in the case of Prussia, government under Roman law is necessarily a government of favor and privilege. It is a government under which individual opportunity is inevitably circumscribed and limited. It is a government which rules a nation founded on the military

principle—a few officers and a great army of privates who can never rise from the ranks. It is a government capable of development into a wonderfully organized machine which performs its functions with amazing precision. It is a government under which a whole people may be moulded to suit the purposes of those in authority. It is a government under which one directing mind can shape the destinies of a nation, as a general can shape the destinies of an army; but it is a government which has never been tolerated by a free people, and which no people could tolerate and remain free.

In the name of "social justice" it is now proposed to erect a replica of Prussian institutions upon American soil. It is proposed that a government of bureaucrats shall regulate the activities of 95,000,000 people. It is proposed to make the National Government a priceless prize for Plutocracy to take possession of and administer for its own profit. It is proposed to turn a great Republic into the theatre of a class war, and every election into a battle for wages, dividends and spoils. It is proposed to reduce American institutions to the dollar-mark and make every man's prosperity a matter of governmental wisdom and generosity. At the head of this system is to be a President of the United States clothed with greater power than any other living man except the Czar of Russia, and he is to hold the liberties, the welfare and the progress of the Nation in the hollow of his hand.

We know from long experience with the tariff what happens when great aggregations of capital are at the mercy of government. For more than a generation the protected industries have been united in a common conspiracy to name Presidents, to name Representatives in Congress and to name United States Senators. For more than a generation this conspiracy has been successful. Sometimes protected industry has lost control of the Presidency. Sometimes it has lost control of the House of

Representatives. Sometimes it has lost control of the Senate; but there has been no time in the last forty years in which it has lost complete control of all the branches of government. Its power has at all times been strong enough during these four decades to prevent the curtailment of its privileges and to thwart every attempt at an honest revision of the tariff in the interest of a plundered people.

Not only that, but in the name of protection to American industry a small group of beneficiaries of tariff extortion have been allowed to sweep American commerce from the high seas. The flag once floated in every port of the known world. Today the traveller may circumnavigate the globe and never see the Stars and Stripes fluttering from anything but the yacht of a millionaire.

What no Congress would have dared to do directly has been done indirectly in the name of protection to American industry. And during all the years that these industries have been taxing the people they have also been consolidating themselves into great financial despotisms that knew no law but their own, no justice but their own, no general welfare except their own sordid profits.

The National Government has not regulated the tariff; the tariff has regulated the National Government, and today the tariff-taxing industries, under threat of panic, defy the American people to interfere with their special privileges.

This is the condition to which the country has been brought by a single experiment in paternalism. What would be the result if the profits of every corporation hinged on the action of government? What would be the result if Washington held in its hands the power of life and death over every dollar invested in interstate trade and commerce in the United States? What would be the result if the rate of dividends on fifty thousand millions of organized capital could be raised or lowered by

the action of the bureaucrats of the Federal Government? What would happen if all the trade, commerce, industry and opportunity of the American people hinged upon the decrees of a single citizen holding the office of President of the United States?

Does any sane human being who knows the history of tariff manipulation doubt what the result would be? Is there the faintest shadow of question that organized Plutocracy would seize upon all the machinery of national authority? That all the billions and billions that Wall Street controls would take possession and keep possession of this Government? That it would make Presidents and Congresses and courts and rule the country by the sheer brute force of money?

Then this is the invitation that the Progressive party holds out to the organized capital of the country in the most far-reaching scheme of centralization ever seriously offered to the American people.

To make it certain that protected industries will redouble their efforts to control the Government the Progressive platform promises a tariff commission which is to "elicit information" and "prescribe a uniform system of accounting for the great protected industries." In other words, it is to pry into all the secrets of protected industry, and to retain even its legitimate trade secrets protected industry must and will own the commission.

To make it certain that all corporations will join hands with the protected trusts and monopolies this platform promises another "strong Federal commission." This commission is to "maintain permanent active supervision over industrial corporations engaged in interstate commerce," doing for them "what the Government now does for the national banks and what it does for the railroads." In the process of such regulation and supervision this commission must "attack unfair competition," control capitalization and enforce publicity.



This is the first platform in American history that ever recognized industrial monopoly as a legitimate object of governmental supervision. The national banks have a monopoly of the issuing of currency; that is the excuse for their existence. So the industrial corporations are to be regulated, supervised and dealt with as the national banks are dealt with. The railroads are natural monopolies, so the industrial corporations are to be dealt with as the railroads are dealt with. Along with this monumental programme of centralization goes "effective Governmental supervision and control" of all the "artificial causes" that affect the cost of living, whatever these causes may be. Thus all the great agencies of finance, of transportation, of trade, of commerce and of industry are to be brought under the authority of the Federal Government, with all the tremendous burden of public and private taxation falling upon the producing and consuming masses.

As the Federal Government can by virtue of its power over national banks take possession of such a bank and appoint a receiver to administer its affairs, so the Federal Government is to be empowered to appoint a receiver for any industrial corporation whenever the bureaucracy at Washington so decrees. If the Federal authority, for example, is displeased with the way that Mr. Oscar Straus's brother manages his department store in New York City, the Federal Government can forthwith appoint a receiver for Macy's and take possession. If the Federal Government believes that a Macy bargain sale is "unfair competition" with Mr. Wanamaker, Mr. Straus is straightway ousted from the store and a hireling office-holder from Washington takes charge of Mr. Straus's stock and credit and property.

As the Federal Government by virtue of its control over railroads as natural monopolies can regulate rates, so the Federal Government is ultimately to fix the price of manufactured articles. As the regulation of railroad

rates affects the wages of railroad employees, so must the fixing of industrial prices regulate the wages of industrial employees.

As the Federal Government in the process of regulating banks and railroads recognizes, legalizes and enforces their monopolistic privileges, so the Federal Government is to regulate, legalize and enforce the monopolistic privileges of all trusts and corporations which it undertakes to supervise.

Under such a form of Government only one thing could happen. Every dollar that is invested in legitimate business would be forced to combine politically with every dollar invested in illegitimate business merely as a matter of self-protection. All property being at the mercy of government, all property would join in a coalition to control the Government. And in such a struggle property would win because it would have the means of corrupting, intimidating and purchasing the votes to carry the election.

Fortunately there is little possibility that this far-reaching scheme of centralized despotism will be adopted next Tuesday at the polls; but that it should be put forward with almost religious fervor by a great political party, led by the only living ex-President of the United States, is a matter of the utmost public concern. That hundreds of thousands of honest, well-meaning citizens should ardently indorse it is a matter of greater public concern. That hundreds of thousands of seemingly intelligent persons should be so ignorant of the history and meaning of their own institutions, so indifferent to the lessons of their own history, is still more disquieting.

This Government once undertook to legalize and regulate human slavery. Although slavery was confined to one section of the country, although it affected fewer than half the States in the Union, although the slave-holding oligarchy numbered only 8,000 men who owned more

than fifty slaves each, yet this oligarchy, in the protection of its property interests, seized the whole Government of the United States. It elected Presidents and Congresses and appointed the Justices of the Supreme Court. It bent all the energies of the Government to the protection of its "peculiar institution," and when its domination was finally challenged by the aroused conscience of the Nation it plunged the Republic into the most disastrous civil war known to history.

The Progressive programme is an invitation to another civil war unless the appeal to blood and iron is evaded by a distracted people's turning en masse to Socialism as their only refuge from the sword and the torch.

Under this programme of supervision and regulation, capital is as sure to control the Government as slavery was to control it under a policy of legalization and restriction. Property always controls government when government goes into partnership with property, because property has the resources and fixity of purpose by which government can be controlled. Out of this plutocracy must come a permanent class of capitalists and a permanent class of laborers. All the small, independent producers must inevitably be eliminated. With their elimination must go all opportunity for the man in the ranks to fight his way to an independent livelihood.

In Germany, where a paternal government has not only set in force all of the Roosevelt schemes of industrial supervision and partnership but all the Roosevelt schemes of social justice for the workingman, the growing discontent of the laboring classes has brought about a condition of affairs in which Socialists, under an honest system of representation and manhood suffrage, would have 65 per cent. of the Reichstag. Year by year the revolt of this disciplined, docile population against a system of government which balances great privilege against small privilege increases, and even the maledictions of the Em-

peror are powerless to stay it. America is not Germany. There can be little room for theorizing as to what the American spirit would be likely to do if it found itself trapped between a centralized government and a centralized plutocracy—the spirit of which Kipling sang:

That bids it flout the law it makes,  
That bids it make the law it flouts;  
Till dazed by many doubts it wakes  
The drumming guns—that have no doubts.

The greatness and glory of the American people have been achieved under a system of law that recognized no divine right in government. This nation has been built up on a system of law that properly distrusted too much government. It has been built up on a system of law that was buttressed in individual independence and individual responsibility. It has been built up on a system of law that defined crimes and punished the guilty, that recognized guilt as personal; not on a system of law that made government the tutor, the guardian, the special providence of every citizen. It has been built up on a system of law that made the Republic opportunity and left every man free to make the most of his life without let or hindrance from constituted authority. When it ceases to be that it is no longer the Republic.

The evils that have been developed under our institutions have come largely through a departure from the principles of our institutions. These evils cannot be remedied by centralizing imperial authority into the hands of a single individual, or by Prussianizing a free people, or by making government the prize of Plutocracy. Least of all can they be remedied by appealing from democracy to Cæsar, from the English law to the Roman law, which has been the inspiration of a thousand tyrants.

Of all of the enthusiastic followers of this new propaganda it is unlikely that one in a thousand ever studied

the Progressive platform in the light of human history, that one in a thousand ever studied it in the light of human experience. They are honest enough, they are sincere enough, they are well-meaning enough. They think they are widening the political opportunities of American manhood. In reality they are widening the opportunities of American plutocracy. Their whole movement is a wild plunge over a precipice.

We are suffering already from too much personal government, from too much privilege, from too much favoritism. We have not kept the faith with our own traditions. We have not kept the faith with our own institutions. The way out is not to rush headlong into centralization, despotism and plutocracy, but to return to first principles. The way out is to emancipate government from private interests, as Gov. Wilson has shown, not to shackle it to every dollar of incorporated capital in the country.

In this campaign Woodrow Wilson is the embodiment of the English law and the American theory of government. Theodore Roosevelt is the embodiment of the Roman law and the Prussian theory of government, with all that it implies. It is possible that this Republic was founded in error. It is possible that the Declaration of Independence was a mistake and the Constitution a blunder. It is possible that the Washingtons, the Franklins, the Jeffersons, the Madisons, the Adamses, the Jacksons and the Lincolns were wrong, and that the Roosevelts, the Perkinses, the Johnsons, the Flinns, the Jane Addamses and the Munseys are right; but *The World*, for one, still holds to the faith of the fathers. It still clings to the great and original principles of free government which are the everlasting glory of the English-speaking peoples.

Long live the Republic!

## A CHARTER OF INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT

[August 15, 1915]

THUS far the new Constitution of New York has been framed in general distrust of popular government.

It is put together on the theory that the State must be tied hand and foot for the next twenty years. The convention is not sitting as a Constitutional Convention, but as an infallible, omnipotent council whose decrees are to remain in force for two decades, regardless of consequences.

Nothing is to be left to the popular will which can be withheld from the popular will. The Legislature is to have no powers which can be wrested from the Legislature. New York is not to have a Constitution that is elastic, under which the Government of the State can be adapted to changing conditions. Everything is fixed and permanent. Ten million people are to be crowded into a political straitjacket and for twenty years the business of government must be shackled by the fears, the whims, the compromises, the selfish impulses and the reactionary theories of a little group of Republican leaders who are engaged in perpetrating organization politics and corporation privilege.

The convention is not seeking to give New York a Constitution under which the people can govern themselves. It is giving New York a Constitution under which the people must submit to being governed in the way this convention thinks they ought to be governed.

Mr. Barnes is the only Republican leader who has the courage to avow his distrust of the proletariat, but that distrust appears in every act of the convention. The other leaders are not so frank or so indiscreet as Barnes, but they are with him in spirit. They do not want popular

government. They do not trust it and they are determined to have as little as possible. New York must take whatever measure they grudgingly give or fall back upon an antiquated Constitution under which the administration of State affairs has all but broken down.

We are not complaining because the convention has set its face against all the fads and vagaries of direct government which were bred of Western populism. We have no desire to see New York abandon the old landmarks and substitute the initiative, referendum and recall for representative government. What we complain of is that the Constitution now in process of construction at Albany is virtually a denial of representative government. It permits neither direct nor representative government, but substitutes the arbitrary rules of a Constitutional Convention for the will of the people during nearly two-thirds the life of a generation.

If the will of this convention, as now manifest, could be put into effect we venture to predict that New York would have the most corrupt and irresponsible government of any State in the Union. No Legislature could remedy the basic evils which the convention purposes to create or to perpetuate. No Governor, however honest, could cope with the monstrous political machine which this charter of invisible government undertakes to create.

For New York to adopt the kind of a Constitution that this reactionary convention is now framing would be to surrender itself into political bondage for twenty years.

### THE OVERSHADOWING PRESIDENT

[Oct. 13, 1905]

HENRY WADE ROGERS, Dean of the Yale Law School, did not exaggerate in his Faneuil Hall speech the growing menace of centralized government in the United States.

The President already has too much power, as Dean Rogers says, and it is now proposed to confer more power upon the Executive by giving into his hands the right to regulate the earnings of \$15,000,000,000 represented in the capitalization of the railways of the country.

Already he has power through his Secretary of Commerce to investigate the organization and management of any corporation or joint-stock company engaged in interstate commerce. Through his subordinates he can examine the books, compel the testimony of witnesses and the production of documents. The information thus obtained is to be made public or not in the President's discretion. Through the agency of the Sherman law he can destroy all trusts and combinations organized or operating in restraint of trade. By means of the Interstate Commerce law he can punish the giver or taker of rebates and can prevent discriminations against shippers.

But the President is not satisfied with the Czar-like power which the Executive already holds over corporations. He is bending his energies to obtain legislation that will enable him to appoint a commission to fix railway rates when a given rate is challenged. This new rate is to take immediate effect and to remain in effect "unless and until" overturned by the courts. Moreover, he is urging an act to provide for the Federal regulation of life-insurance companies, with their \$2,300,000,000 of assets and is also committed to Commissioner Garfield's plan for the licensing by the National Government of all corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

Dean Rogers reminds us "that there may be a man in the White House some time whose intentions will not be so good as those of Washington and Lincoln or Cleveland and Roosevelt." It is time the American people and their representatives in Congress gave intelligent consideration to that most important fact.

The railway officials who oppose the rate bill have



said much about the economic danger of permitting the President to control their corporations. They have said nothing about the vastly greater political danger of the corporations controlling the President. Mr. Hill predicts that Federal regulation of rates would bankrupt two-thirds of the mileage in the country. Mr. Spencer in his Newark speech described the proposed measure as "commercial lynch law."

Whether Federal rate-making would prove disastrous to the railroads is an open question. That it might prove disastrous to a republican form of government is almost obvious. When the President of the United States, through an appointive commission, has even a temporary power over the earnings of the railroads, the railroads will exert every means at their command to control the Presidency. Two insurance companies in eight years contributed \$240,000 to the Republican national campaign fund when they had no peculiar interest of their own to serve. What would the railroads contribute to nominate and elect their own candidate for President if the Executive Department fixed their rates and determined their earnings?

Extreme centralization always has and always will spell despotism of one kind or another. Caesarism need not necessarily be military; it may be commercial. Is it not time for the American people to pause and study the aspects of this newer centralization, which by concentrating in the hands of the Executive such colossal power over organized capital would be eloquently inviting the corporations to take possession of the National Government?

## HAVE THE STATES ABDICATED?

[November 19, 1915]

WHILE the Federal Government is groping for laws under which it can deal with the criminal activities of alien agents and sympathizers, what has become of the States? Have they abdicated?

Arson is not a Federal crime; it is a State crime. Murder is not a Federal crime; it is a State crime. If German conspirators set fire to a munitions plant in Pennsylvania, that is an offense against the laws of Pennsylvania. If they burn a factory in New Jersey, that is an offense against the laws of New Jersey. If they blow up a cartridge plant in Connecticut, that is an offense against the laws of Connecticut. If they conspire in New York to smuggle dynamite into the hold of a steamship lying at a pier in New York, that is an offense against the laws of New York.

Since *The World* first exposed the German conspiracy against American shipping and American munition-makers, we have heard much of the activities of the Federal Secret Service agents, but we hear little about the activities of the State police authorities and of State District Attorneys. Have they no interest in these crimes? Do they assume no responsibility for enforcing their own laws if the offense has more than a parochial significance?

No more extraordinary example of voluntary abdication on the part of State Governments has ever been known than their general indifference to certain alien crimes that have been committed within their jurisdiction in the name of Kultur. Are State officials afraid of the German vote?

## ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

[Nov. 26, 1916]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WORLD:

Will you please have one of your men write a plain, easily understood article describing fully the system of electing a President of the United States—the electoral college, the number of electoral votes from each State, and why, if the people vote individually, the votes are not counted individually for the candidate for election?

A WOMAN READER OF THE WORLD

*New York, November 23.*

THE President of the United States is elected by Presidential electors chosen in the several States for that particular purpose. Or, if no candidate have "a majority of the whole number of electors appointed," the President is elected by the House of Representatives. In that case each State has one vote, which is determined by a majority of its Representatives in Congress.

Every State has as many Presidential electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress. The total number of electors under the last apportionment made by Congress is 531.

The Constitution of the United States provides that each State shall appoint its electors "in such manner as the Legislators thereof may direct." The only restriction imposed is that no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of profit or trust under the United States shall be an elector. The electors in every State are now chosen by popular vote, but this is a concession that has been wrung from the Legislature by the people. In the earlier days of the Republic the Legislatures of a majority of the States made their own appointment of electors. New York did not participate in the first election of Wash-

ington because the two branches of the Legislature quarreled.

So far as the Constitution of the United States is concerned, the legislative power is absolute in the appointment of electors. It could decide that the electors should be chosen by the Stock Exchange, or by Charles F. Murphy, or by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., or by the Board of Estimate of New York City.

This is not the only anomaly in the Constitution in respect to the election of a President. There is no provision whatever for adjusting a contest over the choice of electors. The Commission declares that "The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted." But what is to be done when there are irregularities in the certificates or there are contesting sets of electors? Who is then to count the votes?

The question once brought the Nation to the verge of another civil war, and it has been a prolific source of controversy for three generations. During the last hundred years there has been hardly a Presidential election in which controversies did not arise as to the qualifications and returns of electors. Few of these controversies have been serious because the electoral majority of the successful candidate was so large that the result could not be affected, but in 1876 the country was menaced by civil war.

The original purpose of the Electoral College was to deprive the people of all direct power in the choice of a President. It was not considered safe to entrust them with this power. At the time the Electoral College was created not a single State had manhood suffrage and popular government was distrusted by all except the extreme radicals. Through the medium of electors it was assumed that the selection of the President had been delegated to

a body of wise, dispassionate supermen who would always provide the country with a wise, dispassionate superman President, whether the country approved or not.

An exultant democracy soon nullified that provision except as to the mere machinery of election, and made the electors the agents of a majority of the voters in each State. But Democracy has never been able to rid itself of that cumbersome and dangerous machinery which was created to prevent a popular choice of President. So long as the Electoral College exists in its present form, each Presidential election will carry in it the seeds of a civil conflict. Nor has Congress in the form of legislation ever been able to agree upon a plan that would remove that danger.

*The World* believes in the election of the President by popular vote, but a long step forward would be taken if the electors from each State were not chosen as individuals. That would remove the danger of divided delegations, although it would not prevent a repetition of the Tilden-Hayes contest.

No Republic concerned about its domestic peace and security can afford to tolerate the conditions that have so long existed in the United States in respect to the choice of a chief magistrate, and whatever remedy is decided upon the Electoral College as now constituted must be abolished.

#### IN MEMORIAM

[Jan. 11, 1918]

*The World's* famous question, "Shall the Democratic Party die?" has been answered. The historical Democratic Party is dead.

We do not mean that the Democratic organization has ceased to exist. We do not mean that there are no more

Democrats. Nor do we mean that the Democratic Party is dead in the sense that the Federalist Party is dead, or the Whig Party is dead, or the Greenback Party is dead, or the Populist Party is dead. What has died is the Democratic Party of Jefferson and Jackson and Tilden. The principles of government which they enunciated and advocated have been obliterated. What slavery and secession and silver were unable to accomplish has been brought about by Prohibition and Woman Suffrage.

The death-blow to Jeffersonian Democracy was delivered by the Democratic Senators and Representatives from the South and West under the leadership of William J. Bryan, who carried through the Prohibition Amendment. The *coup de grâce* was administered by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, in indorsing the Federal Suffrage Amendment to the Constitution.

The kind of government for which the Jeffersonian Democracy successfully battled for more than a century has been repudiated. Centralization is now invited, not repelled. State rights have been assassinated in the ancient citadel of State rights. The charter of local self-government has become a scrap of paper. The way is now open for the obliteration of the States in all their essential functions and the erection of a Central Government more powerful than anything of which Alexander Hamilton dared to dream.

Today there are no fundamental differences of principle between Democrats and Republicans. The two parties are interchangeable so far as any vital profession of faith is concerned. Republicans claim to be better business men than Democrats, and hence quicker and slicker in grabbing a dollar; Democrats claim to be more honest and simple-minded than Republicans. Republicans bitterly resent the fact that the Democrats are in possession of the Federal Government. Democrats resent with equal bitterness the disgusting ambition of the Republicans to

get back into power. It is not of such stuff that great parties are formed or great issues are vitalized.

Perhaps it was all inevitable. Perhaps it was ordained that a time would come when an impatient people would deliberately throw away as too cumbersome the old system of checks and balances that the Fathers provided in framing the Constitution and give over the minority to the tyranny of the majority until a new system could be created in the light of better experience. It is difficult to quarrel with events, however much we may regret them, but dangerous to ignore them.

A great revolution has suddenly come about in the Government of the United States. Strangely enough, it has come about during the Presidency of one of the greatest Democrats in all history, whose leadership is hardly less commanding in Europe than at home—a leadership which in many respects holds out hope of democracy in civilization. Yet under that leadership the institutions of the United States have been permanently changed without a word of protest from him in one instance and with his active assistance in the other. The clock cannot be turned back. Yet we may wonder if the President is so keenly absorbed in the processes of anarchy in Russia as to be oblivious to what is happening to our own institutions.

It is possible that out of the stress and circumstance of this World War will come a new Democratic Party in the United States—a Wilsonian Democracy in place of a Jeffersonian Democracy. But can it find means of restoring the balance and provide new methods for insuring that organized self-control without which all free government is bound to sink to the present level of Russia or is forced to establish an elective autocracy as a means of self-preservation? We shall see what we shall see.

Of the two instruments by which the old Jeffersonian Democracy succeeded in committing suicide, the most dan-

gerous weapon, of course, is Prohibition. Suffrage by Federal amendment, in spite of its perversion of the original theory of American institutions, is at least an extension of human freedom. It is not, like Prohibition, an absolute suffocation of individual rights and personal liberties at the mandate of three-fourths of the Legislatures. The Suffrage Amendment may result in as many complications and misfortunes as the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments produced, but we can say of it that ipso facto it invades no man's home, nor does it prescribe what he may eat or what he may drink or how he shall order his life.

At the same time the two amendments taken together, the one championed by Southern Democrats still giving a lip-service to the old party faith and the other indorsed by the President who deliberately abandoned an issue on which he was re-elected in 1916, are as completely at variance with all the fundamental purposes of the old Democracy as those purposes were at variance with Federalism.

*The World* has never been able to regard change and progress as synonymous, and it cannot do so in this instance. Nor can we believe that the advantages of the political expediency which have dictated official Democratic policy in regard to these issues are adequate compensation for the utter sacrifice of principles which had given to the Democratic Party the longest continuous history of any political party in the world.

Possibly we are too apprehensive about the future, but a change of so radical a character may well be considered apprehensively. Each generation must work out its own salvation, and it is not wholly beyond the nature of things that out of the ashes of the old Democratic Party will spring a new democracy more vigorous and more insistent than ever upon those elementary rights without the continuous assertion of which free institutions have never



succeeded in maintaining themselves. That remains to be seen.

*The World* is no prophet of disaster. In paying a respectful tribute to the dead it implies no reproach to the living. But the record is the record.

### THEN AND NOW

[February 9, 1919]

AGREEING with *The World's* statement that the country is legislatively bankrupt, Col. Henry Watterson half-hopefully remarks, "Let me add that in a crisis it has always been." Always?

Col. Watterson himself was a member of the Forty-Fourth Congress which had to meet one of the great crises in the history of the country. Let us examine the Congress which had to deal with the Tilden-Hayes contest and see how it compares with the Congress that is dawdling away the last days of its life in Washington.

Among Col. Watterson's colleagues in the House from Kentucky were Joseph C. S. Blackburn and Proctor Knott. James G. Blaine, William P. Frye and Eugene Hale were among the Representatives from Maine. James A. Garfield, Frank H. Hurd, Henry B. Payne and Charles Foster sat for Ohio districts, and there were included in the New York delegation Abram S. Hewitt, David Dudley Field, Samuel S. Cox, Fernando Wood, Thomas C. Platt, William R. Wheeler, who was Hayes's Vice President, and Elbridge G. Lapham.

Richard P. Bland was in the House from Missouri; William M. Springer, William R. Morrison, Adlai E. Stevenson and Carter H. Harrison from Illinois. Uncle Joe Cannon is the last survivor of that delegation in public life. James Wilson and John A. Kasson were among

the Iowa delegation, along with Alpheus S. Williams, George H. Durand, Omar D. Conger and Jay A. Hubbell from Michigan.

Samuel J. Randall, who was Speaker, and William D. Kelley, represented Philadelphia districts, and the First District of Mississippi sent up Lucius Q. C. Lamar, while Alexander H. Stephens and Benjamin H. Hill were in the House from Georgia.

Among other Representatives of National reputation were George F. Hoar, Nathaniel P. Banks and W. W. Crapo of Massachusetts, John H. Reagan, Roger Q. Mills and David B. Culberson of Texas, Jeremiah M. Rusk of Wisconsin, Henry W. Blair of New Hampshire—and the roll is by no means exhausted. Some of them were eminently respectable and some eminently sinful even according to the political standards of those days, but they were commanding leaders of political thought and knew their trade as legislators.

And look at the Senate of that day! Thomas F. Bayard of Delaware, Roscoe Conkling of New York, Oliver P. Morton of Indiana, John A. Logan and Richard J. Oglesby of Illinois, John J. Ingalls of Kansas, William B. Allison of Iowa, Hannibal Hamlin and Lot M. Morrill of Maine, Thomas W. Ferry and Isaac P. Christiancy of Michigan, George S. Boutwell of Massachusetts, William Windom of Minnesota, John Sherman and Allen G. Thurman of Ohio, Frederick T. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania, Henry B. Anthony of Rhode Island, George F. Edmunds and Justin S. Morrill of Vermont—all of them makers of history and familiarly known to the Nation as such. Col. Waterson, out of the richness of his recollections, could extend the list much further, even the second and third raters ranking head and shoulders above most of the leaders of the Sixty-Fifth Congress.

There must be a reason somewhere for this startling

'decline in the character and capacity of Congress. This Congress, as Col. Watterson insists, is "just as the voters made it," but the voters made the Forty-Fourth Congress, too, and with all its talent and leadership it was in no way superior to its immediate predecessors or to its immediate successors.

It is inconceivable that public intelligence has 'deteriorated in the last forty years to the extent that the relative character of these two Congresses would indicate, but something serious, and very serious, has happened to the public life of the country. In one of the great crises of all history the United States has a Congress of pigmies, and what is still worse, a Congress that does not know it is composed of pigmies. It is not even sensible enough to be reverent in the face of its vast responsibilities.

This is bad enough, but there is no hope for the future. Republican incompetents will succeed Democratic incompetents in the next Congress, so far as leadership is concerned, but the law-making organization will work no better. There will be no more brains in the House and Senate than there are now. What new brains came in as a result of the November election will be smothered under the traditions of seniority. A strange state of affairs for a people who have just decided the destiny of the world and now find themselves without the capacity to set their own house in order.

## A REVOLUTION

[January 16, 1920]

AFTER 12 o'clock tonight the Government of the United States as established by the Constitution and maintained for nearly 131 years will cease to exist.

In its place will be established a new Government,

under which the historic relations between the Federal authority and the several States and the historic relations between the Federal authority and the individual citizens are revolutionized. The fundamental principle upon which the Republic was established and the theory of popular government held by its founders have been destroyed by the Eighteenth Amendment.

Upon this new Government which will come into existence tonight and under which we shall be living tomorrow there has been conferred the most despotic powers to be found in any civilized community, unless we are to regard Bolshevik Russia as civilized.

Police powers hitherto distributed among forty-eight States are taken over by the Federal authority, which at the same time will proceed to regulate the personal habits, customs and recreations of the individual citizen. The housewife who permits a jar of fruit-juice to ferment until its alcoholic content exceeds one-half of 1 per cent. will be liable to arrest and imprisonment as a criminal. The citizen who carries a glass of brandy to an unfortunate fellow-citizen who lies unconscious in the street will likewise be liable to arrest and imprisonment. He too will be a criminal. The citizen who ventures to remove a bottle of beer from one habitation to another without first obtaining the written permission of the new United States Government is likewise a criminal. Should the offender happen to be an alien resident, whatever his status, he will be subject to deportation for this violation of the Constitution and the law of the land.

Together with this assumption of sovereign power over the personal habits of the citizen there comes a new doctrine of property which is recognized nowhere else except in the Russia of Lenine and Trotzky. It was the doctrine of the old Constitution that no person should be "deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use

without just compensation." It is the doctrine of the new Constitution that property may be confiscated and destroyed whenever a sufficient majority of Congress and a sufficient majority of the State Legislatures decide that it shall be confiscated and destroyed. No reason need be given. It is enough to say that confiscation and destruction are a manifestation of moral forces, and no vote of the moral or unmoral forces need be allowed.

Beginning at midnight we shall be living under a Government about which the people of the United States have had nothing to say, a Government created by office-holders for office-holders, a Government that has never known a ballot-box or a referendum and that can be perpetually maintained by the legislative majorities of thirteen of the smallest and most insignificant States of the Union.

Nothing like this has hitherto been known in the history of human freedom. Such centralization of power over the lives and habits of the individual has never before been realized outside the boundaries of Russia. What the ultimate effect of this revolution will be upon the United States we do not pretend to say. No man is wise enough to foresee all the ramifications of this new system that has been decreed or to estimate its ultimate consequences in relation to free institutions. But revolution it is, and only in terms of revolution can it be intelligently discussed.

What we know definitely today is, and all that we know definitely today is, that the fundamental principle of the Government of the United States as defined and established by the Fathers of Republic has been overthrown by the Eighteenth Amendment and at midnight will have been obliterated.

## A TWENTIETH AMENDMENT

[March 23, 1922]

WHEN Secretary Hughes desired to deny the charge that the United States and Great Britain had entered into a secret understanding in regard to the Four-Power Treaty he could not appear before the Senate in person to clear up the Cravath affair. He was obliged to write a letter to Senator Lodge, who presented the letter to the Senate and then became the guarantor, in a way, of the Secretary of State.

Similarly, when Mr. Hughes wished to end the controversy over the authorship of the Four-Power Treaty he could not tell the Senate in person that he framed it. He had to write to Senator Underwood, who had professed to know nothing about the authorship of the Treaty, and then it devolved on Senator Underwood to maintain the Hughes thesis in spite of his comprehensive ignorance.

Another recent instance of the cumbersomeness of the American system of government is provided by the Bonus controversy. Secretary Mellon could not appear before the House and explain why the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee was, in his opinion, financially impossible. He had to write a letter to Chairman Fordney and let it go at that.

Plainly enough, the United States needs a Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution which would provide that all Cabinet officers should be *ex-officio* members of the House and Senate, with all the privileges and immunities of other members except the right to vote. That would make impossible so futile a debate as that which the Senate has carried on in respect to the conference Treaties and such a farce as the House has played with the Bonus

Bill. Moreover, the responsibility of the Administration would be definitely established through its Cabinet representatives.

If such an amendment were in force, Mr. Hughes himself would have represented the case for the Treaties. There would have been no need of letter-writing. He would have been on the floor of the Senate in person to supply all the information that was demanded and to answer all questions. When the Senate had finished with him and he had finished with the Senate, all the mysteries would have been cleared away and no Senator could pretend that he did not know what he was voting for or what he was voting against.

Under such an amendment Secretary Mellon would have borne the brunt of the debate on the Bonus Bill, and properly so, because it is a measure of vital importance to the management of the Nation's finances. It would not have been necessary for him to write to Mr. Fordney and it would not be possible for anybody to evade the financial issue that the Secretary would of necessity bring to the front. After the House was through with Mr. Mellon it might be just as eager as ever to buy the soldier vote with a Bonus Bill, but the country at large would have a clearer understanding of the issue than it could ever get from the fragmentary discussion that had been carried on in Washington.

Under the existing system a Cabinet officer may appear before a committee of the House or Senate and answer questions, but his responsibility ends there, and his legislative usefulness ends there too. He does not appear in the debate, but if the debate is to have either value or purpose it must raise dozens of questions that were not considered by the committee. Many of these questions can be answered intelligently only by the head of the department that is affected by the pending legislation.

Responsible government in Washington has ceased.

Nothing works well except the checks and balances. A Government that is constitutionally deadlocked with itself cannot function except in a limping, halting fashion. It is bound to require a maximum of effort to produce a minimum of results.

To recast the Federal system would be a task of almost insurmountable difficulty, but there are no formidable obstacles in the way of making the members of the Cabinet *ex-officio* members of the House and Senate as well. That would give to the Government of the United States a measure of responsibility which it has never yet attained and which it must attain if it is to meet the more important problems that an increasingly complex political State is thrusting upon it.

## A BREAK-DOWN OF GOVERNMENT

[December 8, 1922]

DOES the Attorney-General of the United States understand all the implications of the complaint that he makes in his annual report?—

The failure of local self-government in parts of the country results in the insistence of the citizens of those communities that the Federal Government perform that function in which the local Government has failed.

What Mr. Daugherty is recording is not merely the break-down of local self-government but the break-down of American institutions. He himself admits that the Federal Government as now organized can no longer carry the burden that has been thrown upon it, and so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, "we are rapidly approaching a point where a revamping of the Government machinery used in this work is inevitable." But re-



vamping the machinery cannot long be effective if the process of extending the Federal jurisdiction is to go on.

No fewer than 60,722 criminal cases were begun last year in the name of the United States, and only 53,155 were terminated. The Supreme Court itself is now more than two years behind its docket, with little prospect of catching up, and Congress is forever preparing new extensions of the Federal authority.

Mr. Daugherty is only half-right, and hardly that, when he says that it is the failure of local self-government which is responsible for the multiplication of Federal activities. In most instances this has come about wholly as a result of political propaganda and the desire of members of Congress to placate minority groups. This was certainly the case with the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Law.

Until they were foisted upon the country by political manipulation, local self-government was dealing with the liquor traffic in the way that local sentiment demanded. In some States there was complete Prohibition, and where public opinion supported it this Prohibition was enforced. In other States there was a license system, with local option, and communities decided for themselves. Suddenly, the business of regulating the habits of the American people was taken from the people themselves and transferred to the Government of the United States, and the Department of Justice can no longer grapple with its burden.

Had it not been for a filibuster organized in the last days of the extra session of Congress the Federal authority would have been saddled with the responsibility for suppressing lynching too, although lynching is a crime in every State and can never be exterminated except by the militant public opinion of the several States. The demand for a Lynching law did not come from communities which were dissatisfied with local government, as Mr. Daugh-

erty's general indictment implies. It came from politicians in Congress who thought they could thereby placate the dissatisfied Negro vote.

And thus the record runs. Local self-government is weakened and the energies of the National Government are dissipated. This steady centralization of Federal authority which is destroying the efficacy of all government has not come about through the insistence of small minorities using their influence with complaisant Senators and Representatives. Mr. Daugherty assumes that these new powers have been thrust upon the National Government. The truth is that in most cases the National Government has seized them without waiting for a mandate or desiring a mandate.

The fact that some of these extensions of Federal authority seem beneficent in themselves is beside the point. Whether good or bad, the American system of government was not designed to enable a highly centralized authority to function. It was established as a government of enumerated and delegated powers, a government of checks and balances, with the idea that all the powers not expressly delegated should remain with the States or with the people themselves.

All the trouble comes from the persistent attempt to make the United States Government do what its founders never intended it should do. Mr. Daugherty himself practically admits as much, but he is afraid to meet the logic of the situation and say that there is no way except for Congress and the Executive to abandon their schemes of further centralization and try to get government in the United States back to its first principles.

IS OUR DEMOCRACY STAGNANT?<sup>1</sup>

[From *Harper's Magazine*, June, 1923]

OF all the self-governing nations that emerged from the blood and welter of the World War none of them fashioned its constitution after that of the United States. All of them rejected congressional government in favor of parliamentary government.

From one point of view this choice was extraordinary, because at the time it was made the United States was at the zenith of its power and influence in international affairs. No other country in all history had ever attained such prestige. Not only had its vast influence thrown into the balance decided the issue of the War, but at the word of its President, kings and emperors had abdicated, dynasties had crumbled, empires had ceased to be empires.

Europe had seen a pacifist American democracy, drawn into conflict against its will, accomplish through its gigantic economic resources a military feat for which there is no parallel. This achievement might have been expected to appeal to the imagination of European statesmen suddenly confronted with the difficult and precarious task of establishing popular government in place of autocratic government. But none of the nations that owed its emancipation to American intervention in the war had sufficient admiration for the American political system to adopt it as the model for its own institutions.

However much the United States may be respected or envied or feared, it had lost its leadership in what might be called the town-meeting of world democracy. Everywhere the elastic, flexible and responsive British system, divested of the ornamental trappings of monarchy, is pre-

<sup>1</sup> Copyright, 1923, by Harper & Brothers. All Rights Reserved.

ferred to the rigid, unyielding, unresponsive American system, with its enumerated powers and its carefully contrived mechanism of checks and balances. If we are to seek the reason for it we must go back to the origin of the Constitution itself.

When the convention that framed it met in Philadelphia, May 25, 1787, George III was on the throne of England, Catharine the Great was Empress of Russia, Louis XVI was King of France, Frederick the Great had died in August of the previous year. Napoleon Bonaparte was an obscure young lieutenant of artillery in the French army. There can be no more vivid description of the political state of the world when the Constitution of the United States came into being than the mere recital of these names. They spell what government was like when the Fathers of the Republic set out to draft a new charter for themselves and their posterity.

For nearly seven score years it has been the fashion to exalt them as supermen, and they were supermen if to be a superman is to know precisely what one wishes to do and to obtain that end regardless of all obstacles. The mistake has come, not from thinking of them as supermen, but from thinking of them as prophets who must at all times be vindicated notwithstanding the lessons of experience.

The Constitution of the United States was not devised to be an instrument of democracy for the excellent reason that the men who framed it did not believe in democracy, which was to them a synonym for mob rule. They knew that all previous democracies had been only a prelude to despotism. They had no more respect for the sovereignty of the people than for any other sovereignty. What they knew to their cost was that power of any kind was likely to be mischievous. They would have agreed cordially with John Adams's great-grandson, Henry Adams, that "power is poison," and so in the es-

tablishment of a government, they undertook to neutralize power whenever it could be neutralized. To this end, they worked out a most ingenious system which has finally left their descendants in a state of political bewilderment.

To begin with, the Federal government was to be one of enumerated powers. Nothing was to be taken for granted. In the next place, it was to be a government of co-ordinate and independent branches. The executive was to have no control over the legislature or over the courts. The legislature was to have no control over the executive or over the courts. The courts were to have no control over the executive or the legislature. Each was to do its work independently of the other.

The choice of an executive was to be removed as far as possible from the people. It was therefore delegated to electors who were to be appointed as the legislatures of the several states might direct. In other words, the President was to be named by a carefully selected congregation of the Best Minds.

The principle of democracy had necessarily to be recognized somewhere in the election of a congress, so it was restricted to the House of Representatives. The representatives were to be chosen by the people of the states on the basis of population, but as a permanent brake on the House, a Senate was created in which each state was to have equal representation. This nullified every principle of democracy, and every principle of representative government for that matter. Thus the Senate came into being as a constitutional manifestation of a rotten borough system, and seventy-seven thousand persons in Nevada now counterbalance ten million persons in New York.

To make sure that the Senate would always be a counterbalance to popular passion, it was further provided that the terms of only one-third of the senators should expire every two years with the House of Repre-

sentatives. This not only made the Senate a continuous body, but it also made it impossible that a majority of the Senate should ever be haled before the court of public opinion of the nation. One-third of the senators might be disciplined by an indignant populace, but the other two-thirds remained to sit tight and wait for the storm to blow over. Furthermore, inasmuch as representation in the Senate had no relation to population, the smallest State having the same number of senators as the largest State, a legislative system was established in which the ultimate power was vested in the minority, and so it has remained to this day.

The American Constitution may or may not be, as Mr. Gladstone said, "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," but nothing could be farther from the truth than to regard it as an instrument of democracy, for that is precisely what it was never intended to be, and what nineteen different amendments have never succeeded in making it be. Nevertheless, it served the purpose of its founders. It established the central government which they needed to carry on foreign affairs, to provide for the common defense and to regulate interstate commerce, which meant to them that it was not to be regulated at all. It corrected the deficiencies of the Confederation without taking from the States the general control over their own affairs, which were the important affairs as affecting the daily life of the American people. The Federal government did not touch these relationships at all, and for at least a century the average American had no personal contact with the government of the United States except as the postmaster or the letter carrier embodied the Federal authority.

The main thing about the Constitution of the United States is that the men who framed it and set it going made it work. No higher tribute than that can be paid to

political genius; and the fact that the government worked was eventually ascribed to the Constitution itself, which presumably had made it possible for a free people to administer their own affairs. A Constitution that worked inevitably became an object of veneration. American citizens divided into most bitterly hostile camps, and carried on political wars that closely resembled civil wars; but the one thing on which there was unity was devotion to the Constitution itself. They differed rancorously and vindictively and with assault and battery as to how the Constitution was to be construed, but no faction ever tired of proclaiming its ardent and unselfish attachment to the Constitution itself. Even while the issue of secession was drawing the nation into the vortex of civil war, no responsible leader north or south ever flaunted the Constitution. On the contrary, everybody except a few ribald abolitionists who were deplored by North and South alike was for the Constitution, provided he was allowed to interpret it.

It is not strange that the American people came to regard their Constitution as a fetish. For decades the government established under it was the only responsible expression of the principle of free institutions to be found in a world of kings, emperors, autocrats, and despots. It was the only government professing to derive its powers from the consent of the governed, under which property was protected, and human life was as secure as local custom decreed. It was the only government in which the average man had a chance to participate, and so it came to be assumed that only the Constitution of the United States stood between democracy and monarchy. Nor was that assumption so very far fetched. For after all, the Republic had proved to be a bulwark of freedom for men with white skins, and the Constitution was the Great Charter of the Republic. In one way or another, the hope of political liberty was bound up in this experiment.

The American had achieved the political equality for which other men had died in vain. There was no caste system to keep everybody in the station in which God had appointed him. There was no nobility to ride roughshod over the rights of the peasant, and no peasant for that matter to be trampled under foot. No king seized upon a subject to impress him into military service to fight in wars about which he knew nothing, for there were no subjects. Moreover, the burdens that the government laid upon the citizen were light. There were no direct taxes to vex him, and he was never quite sure who paid the indirect taxes. He was a free man with a free vote and a free house, and what more could anybody ask? A Constitution with all this to its credit seemed indeed something more than human in a world of privilege, repression, and aristocratic pretense.

All religions have this in common, that soon or late they are reduced to a creed, and then the creed solidifies. Even after the articles of faith have lost all their primary significance in relation to the daily life of the adherent, the passionate attachment to the formula remains. Men feel instinctively that if they give anything up, if they admit the possibility of error, the whole structure may crumble, and they will be left naked to the elements of doubt and damnation. It is a very human fear, and the American people have given it a free rein in respect to their institutions. In theory they never cease to exalt the Constitution. In practice they have been engaged for a century and a quarter in desperate attempts to break the shackles which the Constitution riveted upon their political limbs.

They achieved an early success so far as the Presidency was concerned. The Electoral College in its original inception did not outlive Washington. Then the party system for which the Philadelphia convention made no provision intervened, a little clumsily, to be sure, but



effectively for all that. Soon the congressional caucus had taken over the business of making presidents and the Electoral College became the rubber stamp that it still remains. But the congressional caucus was still too remote from the political life of the American people ever to become popular. It was more objectionable in many respects than the Electoral College as originally devised, because it tended to corrupt both the executive and legislative branches. Out of the revolt against King Caucus came one of the most remarkable instruments of free institutions that was ever evolved from the political genius of any people—the nominating convention.

Without changing a line or a letter in the Constitution, it accomplished three things in the evolution of popular government which the Constitution skillfully endeavored to prevent. It put the election of the President directly into the hands of the people themselves. It established party government, and made the President *ex-officio* the leader of his party in Congress. This was the longest political step forward that the American people ever took on their own initiative. It is perhaps the longest step forward that any people ever took on their own initiative without violence and without destruction.

The national convention, in spite of the inroads made by the direct primary, remains unique. It is extra-constitutional and extra-legal. It chooses its own officers. It makes its own rules. It is its own court of last resort. It passes on the qualifications of all the delegates. It has no statute authority to do anything whatsoever or to bind anybody whomsoever. Yet for nearly a century no presidential elector has ever ventured to cast a vote for any candidate for President except the candidate nominated by the convention of his party. With no legal authority to enforce its mandates or to punish disobedience, the national convention has been a government within a government, selecting the presidents outside the Constitution

and making the Electoral College the instrument to record its will.

Thus, long ago, the American people democratized the Presidency, but beyond that they have never been able to break down the barriers which the Constitution erected against democracy.

In respect to Congress, they have practically no progress to report; yet it is against Congress that most of their political discontent is directed, and Congress is, without question, the outstanding failure of the Constitution. It was once thought that the sources of trouble lay in the election of senators by the State Legislatures, but when the Constitution was finally amended to provide for the election of senators by a direct vote of the people, nothing at all happened, except that the Senate declined rather than improved in ability. Everything went on as before. All that has come out of the direct primary is the disintegration of party government and the rise of bloc government, to the increasing dissatisfaction of the country. The principal achievement of the direct primary is the breakdown of party lines and the confusion of party issues.

The attempt to impose this system of direct government upon a system of representative government has done nothing to solve the political problems of the country. Rather, it has helped to make a bad matter worse. The inherent evil of the congressional system is that it is unresponsive to begin with, and the direct primary, by weakening party authority, has also made it irresponsible, except in the narrowest and most sectional sense. More than any other agency, it has given the national legislature over to the control of organized minorities.

All of this might not matter so much if the character of American civilization had not so completely changed since the Constitution was adopted. When Washington and his associates met in Philadelphia to revise the articles

of Confederation they were considering the political necessities of an agricultural and mercantile population. The system of transportation that they knew did not differ in any important respect from that known to Tut-ankh-amen. In fact, historians are generally agreed that the eighteenth-century's means of communication were inferior to those of the Roman Empire. The eighteenth century had piled a little more canvas on the yards of the sailing ship, but as for land communications, the roads were much worse than those built by Cæsar, and a horse could run no faster than he could in the days of Babylon.

In a new country without quarrelsome neighbors, with unlimited land and unlimited resources, with a virile population able to take care of itself in most circumstances and no serious economic questions to disturb it, the problems of government were simple, especially the problems of Federal government. No sooner did a real issue become acute, however, than the congressional system proved impotent to cope with it. Every other nation managed to rid itself of the institution of human slavery without violence. In the United States it was settled only by four years of civil war.

What wrought the revolutionary change in American affairs, however, was not a civil war which a higher statesmanship could have averted, but the development of the railroad, which, in turn, produced the industrial civilization that supplanted the agricultural civilization of the eighteenth century. For nearly a hundred years after the Constitution was adopted, the interstate commerce clause remained dormant, and Congress made practically no use of the grant of power. For the last thirty years the political and economic history of the United States has pivoted round a single paragraph.

Slavery was the nineteenth-century's irrepressible conflict under the Constitution. Interstate commerce is the twentieth-century's irrepressible conflict. In the regula-

tion of interstate commerce Congress has gone from commission to commission, from bureaucracy to bureaucracy. It has muddled everything without really settling anything except the supremacy of its own powers. The more it regulates, the more intimately it touches the daily lives of the people, the louder is the clamor for more regulation on the part of those who are dissatisfied with the previous adjustments. Beginning with a government that laid no appreciable burdens upon the ordinary citizen, and that rarely came in contact with him, we have progressed to a government that regulates trade, that regulates transportation, that regulates wages, that regulates profits, that, incidentally, tells the American people what they may eat, what they may drink and how they may amuse themselves without violating the canons of an impeccable morality, and what the doctor may prescribe in a case of pneumonia.

The states have been stripped to the skeleton, and the Federal government has been centralized to an extent that would have been deemed unbelievable even a quarter of a century ago. If we are to admit the desirability of all this super-Prussianism on the ground that the national authority alone is competent to supervise in the public interest an economic development which knows no state lines, we must also admit that the congressional system is probably the clumsiest instrument that could be devised for such supervision.

The government of the United States cannot function at all in respect to policy when the President and a majority of Congress happen to belong to different parties. Neither can it function in respect to policy when the House and the Senate happen to be under different party control, which is by no means infrequent. The government can continue to perform the routine functions of administration, but for the rest it is 'deadlocked, until one side or another can win a decisive victory at the polls.

When the victory is won, there is seldom general agreement in interpreting the meaning of the ballot—and there is always the Senate.

Whatever defects are inherent in parliamentary government, it has one unfailing source of strength. It must of necessity settle one thing at a time, and it is always possible to get a vote of the people on a single issue. What is equally important, responsibility cannot be evaded. There is no way of shifting it from the legislative to the executive department, and back from the executive to the legislative. There is no way of shifting it from the House to the Senate, or from the Senate to the House.

The American people were never before so critical of their government as they are now. They were never before so cynical about their government. They rail at the politicians, they jeer at Congress, they blackguard the President, whoever he happens to be, but they never stop to inquire whether their government was established to meet the demands they are making on it. If they did, they would be obliged to admit that it was not. They ask a rigid, inflexible government to function as a responsive and flexible government. They ask a government of checks and balances to function as a political manifestation of democracy. They ask a government of co-ordinate and independent branches to function as a unit. It cannot be done. In spite of all their ardent devotion to the Constitution, it is apparent that they know little about the Constitution. They have turned it into a fetish and they burn a vast quantity of incense before it, but they have forgotten its origin and have lost contact with its purposes. What they think it is, or what they think it must be, is something that it was never intended to be, and can never be made to be, except by a process of almost revolutionary revision.

American democracy is now a stagnant democracy. The great world stream of popular government has swept

past it, leaving it isolated. Enormous material prosperity has paralyzed its initiative and made it timid. A democracy that once dared and dared magnificently now alternately mumbles about its troubles and mutters about the greatness of the Fathers. It has abandoned its traditions of individual liberty and forgotten the ancient faith that it exalts. Hag-ridden by statute, it hardly ventures to call its soul its own.

Undoubtedly the American people still believe in 'democracy. At least, they always say they do, but they are afraid to trust themselves whenever an issue is raised. The world moves on politically. The England of George III is now an England in which the British labor party in Parliament is His Majesty's Opposition, but the United States in its mechanism of government holds fast to the eighteenth century. More than that, it refuses to concede that anything of general importance has been learned about the science of government since the eighteenth century, and previous to the French Revolution.

## CHAPTER IV

### WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

**T**WICE before Mr. Cobb came to New York *The World* had to deal with William J. Bryan as the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party. It had done this good-naturedly, never hurling epithets, branding silver leaders as robbers or accusing six million voters of being thieves. The more effectively for its moderation, it had conducted a campaign of fiscal education. When in 1908 Mr. Bryan was a third time nominated *The World* came reluctantly to his support. The silver issue had been settled and on the issue of imperialism *The World* sympathized with Mr. Bryan. Before the convention, however, it protested against his nomination—most effectively by circulating in its own columns and in a widely distributed pamphlet the “Map of Bryanism,” showing the United States with those States which had been carried for Mr. Bryan in white, with the Republican States in black. The contrast between the political map of 1892 and the map of 1907 was startling, the Democratic territory in the latter year being not much wider than the solid South.

#### MR. BRYAN'S BLIND POOL

[August 30, 1906]

HAS ever an American citizen who was not a great military hero returned from abroad to such a free-will

'delirious greeting as Mr. Bryan's friends and followers have ordered for his home-coming?

Mr. Bryan wears no war-made laurels. No captives have been chained to his chariot wheels. Both his victories and his defeats have been those of peace. He holds neither civil nor military office. Yet every section of the country is sending its delegates to greet the man whom a great political organization has already chosen as its candidate for President of the United States in 1908. Madison Square Garden can hold only a fraction of the roaring thousands that will acclaim him tonight in a demonstration far more remarkable than that of ten years ago, when he made his first historical excursion into "the enemy's country" and was received at Madison Square Garden as no other candidate for President had ever been received.

The crowds of 1896 were swayed by curiosity and class hatred. They wished to see the square-jawed young man who by a single speech had lifted himself from obscurity to a Presidential nomination, and who purposed to crucify the arrogant money power upon its own cross of gold. Quite a different feeling will move the crowds in New York tonight. Mr. Bryan is no longer merely an oratorical curiosity in the metropolis, and whatever exists of the class hatred of 1896 appears in new forms. Other reasons must be sought for the enthusiasm of 1906.

What is the mystery of this extraordinary popularity? Some of it is undoubtedly personal. Mr. Bryan is a wholesome, hearty chap, full of red blood and the milk of human kindness. Like Kipling's Fuzzy Wuzzy he is a first-class fighting man, and most Americans like a man who is ready to battle for his beliefs, no matter whether he be right or wrong. Mr. Bryan has much of the personal charm which made Henry Clay the best-beloved man of his generation, but which could never make him President. And at a time when oratory is in a state of



decay he is an exceptionally clever and forceful speaker. All this serves to account for the admiration of thousands of individuals, but does it explain why a great historical party persists, despite its terrible defeats under his leadership, in making him its candidate for President again two years in advance of the nominating convention? Does it explain why all the factions of that party should frenziedly unite upon him as their standard-bearer and begin the campaign of 1908 in the summer of 1906?

It is difficult to find anything in Mr. Bryan's conduct to account for this spontaneous uprising. He has not changed in ten years, except, as he says, to become more radical. While he is willing to hold the silver issue in abeyance "for the present," he still holds to his old theories of bimetalism. Presumably, he still clings to all the idiosyncrasies of the 1896 campaign, including the threat to "reorganize" the Supreme Court of the United States. In addition he has advanced the most preposterous theory of government ownership that was ever promulgated for a democracy—a scheme of State Socialism absolutely revolutionary; a scheme that would add at least a million of new office-holders to the grand army of existing party workers; a scheme under which the National Government is to take over all trunk-line railroads, the State Governments the other railroads within their borders, the city governments the utilities within their territory, the people to proceed with the management of the most perplexing public served hodgepodge that the mind of man ever conjured with.

If the American people considered Bryan unsafe in 1896 and 1900, wherein is he safer now? In what respect is he a cooler counselor or a wiser leader than he was then? Yet State convention after State convention enthusiastically indorses him. Illinois, where he refused an indorsement unless he could control the National Committeemen, is not less effusive in its resolution than

Texas and Ohio is not to be outdone by either, while the anti-16-to-1 New York Democrats may be called on to exhaust rhetoric itself in proclaiming their devotion to the peerless leader.

This is an amazing state of affairs, and yet a state of affairs for which Mr. Bryan cannot be held responsible. He is asking for none of this adulation and for none of these pledges. He is merely taking what his fellow-partisans offer him, and the ambitious politician who could refuse such testimonials of confidence would have to be more than human.

Yet what is the result? Are not the Democrats of the country, by their folly and stupidity, tying their own hands and closing the door of opportunity upon themselves? So far as it lies in their power, they have made Mr. Bryan their candidate for President in 1908 without knowing what issues may be before the country two years hence or what Mr. Bryan's attitude toward those issues will be. Must not every speech he makes from today until election day in 1908 necessarily be a campaign speech? Must not every word he utters inevitably commit his party? His overzealous followers have given him *carte blanche* to make the issues, frame the platform and shape the campaign. Indeed, they have given him a blank power of attorney to manage the affairs of the Democratic party for the next two years and commit it to any policy, idea, fad or mistake he pleases, and this in the name of politics. Is not "extraordinary" a mild word with which to describe such a situation?

There will be Congressional elections in every State of the Union this fall. Out of thirty-three Northern and Western States twenty-three will elect Governors. Only three of these States now have Democratic Governors and two of them are "accidental." In several of these twenty-three States there might be a fighting chance of Democratic success next November if the party were left

free to take the fullest advantage of local issues. A similar situation exists in scores of Congressional districts. But will not the speeches which Mr. Bryan makes in New York tonight and elsewhere during the campaign inevitably tend to obscure local issues? His utterances will be in the nature of a Democratic platform. He himself will be an issue which the Republicans will seize upon with avidity. Where local conditions are against them they can appeal to the party loyalty of disaffected voters with this question: "Are you going to indorse Theodore Roosevelt, with his record of triumphant achievement, or are you going to follow William J. Bryan, the theorist and agitator?" Forcing the 1908 campaign gives the Republicans their chance to pit Roosevelt against Bryan in every district where there are disgruntled Republican voters. And if they elect a clear majority of the next House of Representatives in November, and the Western States which Mr. Bryan carried in 1896 go Republican again this year, what sort of position will the Democratic party be in? Must not this premature contest be scored as another Bryan defeat, to the further discredit of the party itself?

If Democratic politicians, knowing that Mr. Bryan cannot be elected, but actuated by a lofty devotion to principle which scorns success, or a success only of the remote future, insisted, nevertheless, on following him to rout, that would be magnificent, although it would not be politics. But this is not the altar upon which they are making their party sacrifice. Conventions and politicians alike are shouting for Mr. Bryan on the pretext that if nominated in 1908 he is sure to be elected. What could be more absurd?

Are all of them sincere, or have some honestly mistaken personal popularity for political strength? Nobody will deny Mr. Bryan's personal popularity. It is probably nowhere stronger than in his own State, where

he is best known. But loving Mr. Bryan and voting for his principles are different pairs of sleeves. Anybody doubting it is invited to examine the Nebraska election for the last ten years. In 1896 Mr. Bryan carried his State by 13,576. In 1900 Mr. McKinley carried it by 7,822. In 1904 Mr. Roosevelt carried it by 86,682. Every Congressman and every State officer is a Republican. Every Western State that Mr. Bryan carried in 1896 is now Republican on national issues. The West may still love Mr. Bryan, but it prefers to elect Republicans to office, declining to mix its affections with its politics.

A 1906 reception to William J. Bryan, the distinguished American orator, journalist and private citizen, is one thing, but a 1906 ovation to William J. Bryan, the next Democratic candidate for President, is quite another. It is the most mysterious "blind pool" ever organized by misguided politicians. It is the most impolitic, foolish abdication of power on the part of a great political organization ever recorded in the history of the United States. Even the partisans of Louis Napoleon waited until they had elected him President before they made him a dictator, but the Democrats of the United States are completely abdicating their self-control and party self-government by making Mr. Bryan their party dictator before they have elected him to anything. "A mad world, my masters."

## TWELVE YEARS OF BRYANISM

[From "The Map of Bryanism," Feb., 1908]

FOR nearly twelve years, Mr. Bryan, you have been the leader—yes, the dictator—of the Democratic party in the United States. With but one exception, its policies

have been your policies; its principles, your principles; its platforms, your platforms.

After twelve years of such domination, during which time the party has gone down to three successive national defeats, piling disaster upon disaster and ruin upon ruin, your friends insist not only that you are the most available candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1908, but that you are the only available candidate, and you yourself have issued a statement expressing your readiness and willingness to accept the nomination—a statement, by the way, which your supporters confidently claim has eliminated all other candidates from the field.

If the Democracy has prospered so greatly under your leadership that the irresistible logic of events compels your nomination again in 1908, that fact ought to be apparent from an impartial inventory of the party's political assets.

We purpose, therefore, to take some account of your stewardship and render thereon an unprejudiced and dispassionate report.

Excepting Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson no other Democrat has dominated his party so long or so completely as you, Mr. Bryan.

Of the twenty-eight years of Jefferson's active leadership the party was in power twenty-four. Of the sixteen years of Jackson's active leadership the party was in power twelve.

*Under your leadership the party has not been in power a single day, a single hour, a single minute.* It has steadily lost ground, until at this time it is almost without force at the North, except in local affairs; it is menaced even at the South, where it lost Kentucky in the last November election, and its ancient strongholds are either in possession of the Republicans or are held by a tenure at once precarious and disquieting.

You began your domination of the Democratic party

in a period of great financial disturbance. You now purpose to be the Democratic candidate for President in another period of great financial disturbance, as the nominee of a political party whose reputation for financial sanity you have discredited all over the civilized world. Not only have you failed to recant as to your past financial heresies, but you have steadfastly adhered to your free-silver delusions. No longer ago than Dec. 7, in a speech at Freeport, Ill., you declared that your financial policy in 1896 had been "vindicated."

In such circumstances you may well say that the action of the party in again nominating you "cannot be made dependent upon the prospect of success." What prospect of success could there be?

As an orator, Mr. Bryan, you have few peers. As an agitator you are without a rival. No man could have reached and held the position that is yours without qualities of a high order. Alone among Americans of recent years you have maintained political leadership in the face of repeated disaster and seemingly because of it.

If we take issue with such a man we must leave nothing to mere assertion, and we must wholly disavow malice and prejudice. We shall consider Bryan the politician, the party leader, not Bryan the man.

For the purpose of demonstrating the error of your assumption more plainly than in words or figures, we print herewith maps of the United States showing the States carried by Democrats and Republicans in the years 1892, 1896, 1900 and 1907:

These maps speak for themselves. If they do not answer your question, "And when has a party out of power increased its strength more rapidly than the Democratic party has?" there can be no answer. If they do not answer your assertion that "the Democratic party is more united than it has been in many years," there can be no answer.

The Democratic party went out of power in the nation March 4, 1897. Four years earlier it controlled 23 of the 44 States, the Republicans 17 and the Populists 4.

In Congress the party division was as follows Senate—Democrats, 44; Republicans, 38; Independent, 1; Alliance, 2; vacancies, 3: House—Democrats, 220; Republicans, 128; Populists, 8.

The popular vote in 1892 was: Democratic, 5,556,918; Republican, 5,176,108; Populist, 1,041,028 (Weaver, for whom you voted).

The electoral vote in the same year was: Democratic, 277; Republican, 145; Populist, 22.

What was the situation Nov. 14, 1907, Mr. Bryan, after eleven years of your leadership, when you announced your receptive candidacy?

Of the 46 States the Democrats controlled 13 and the Republicans 33.

The popular vote in the Presidential election of 1904 was: Republican, 7,623,486; Democratic, 5,077,971; Socialist, 402,283. The electoral vote was: Republican, 336; Democratic, 140.

In Congress the party division now is: Senate—Republicans, 61; Democrats, 31. House—Republicans, 223; Democrats, 168.

In 1893 there were Democratic United States Senators from California, Illinois, Indiana, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Wisconsin. In 1907, when you reviewed your work and found Democratic conditions and prospects so pleasing, there was not a single anti-Republican Senator from a Northern State except two silver men from Colorado and Nevada respectively. The Republicans had gained a Senator, not only in Colorado, but in Missouri.

Whole States at the North are without Democratic representation in Congress and from the Atlantic to Pacific,

north of the Ohio River, there are but six Democratic Governors, viz: James M. Higgins, Rhode Island; John A. Johnson, Minnesota; Joseph K. Toole, Montana; John Sparks, Nevada; John Burke, North Dakota, and George E. Chamberlain, Oregon. Singularly enough, these are all found in States which are normally Republican or Populistic. Kentucky has just gone Republican, electing an entire State ticket by the second largest majority the State has given to any candidate in fifteen years.

Throughout the North, in the cities and in the counties, Democrats have been driven from places which the party has controlled for generations, and in hundreds of localities no representative of the party holds a public position, except as he may have been appointed thereto by some considerate or patronizing Republican or is protected by the provisions of a civil service law.

Such today is the condition of the historic Democratic party, Mr. Bryan, after twelve years of your leadership.

### BRYAN'S NOMINATION MEANT TAFT'S ELECTION

[November 4, 1908]

MR. TAFT owes his election less to his own strength than to Mr. Bryan's weakness.

This fatal weakness was apparent to *The World* months before either of the national conventions assembled. Day after day we warned the Democracy against it. The morning after Mr. Taft's nomination this newspaper declared without reservation that Bryan's nomination means Taft's election, and the vote yesterday abundantly vindicated this prediction.

Mr. Bryan's friends insisted, however, that he was entitled to another nomination backed by a united party. They had their way. Mr. Bryan received his nomination



and a party more united than it has been since 1892 loyally supported him; but even a united party could not overcome the handicap of Mr. Bryan's political record. He was weaker than his party, as shown by the vote for Governor in New York, Minnesota, Illinois and elsewhere; weaker than his issues, which he made still weaker by the stupendous folly of posing as Roosevelt's heir.

Mr. Bryan's overwhelming defeat is made the more significant by reason of Mr. Taft's vulnerability. The Republican candidate had to bear the burden of general hard times; of a million men out of employment; of business interests complaining and dissatisfied; of a steadily increasing cost of living; of an unparalleled disaffection of labor leaders; of an unparalleled disaffection of the Negro vote; of Republican factional fights in the great pivotal States of New York, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois; of a reactionary platform which he was obliged to modify in his speech of acceptance; of an insidious use of religious prejudice and bigotry against Mr. Taft's liberal and advanced belief; of a popular resentment against Mr. Roosevelt's determination to name his successor and a Proxy.

The hard-times issue alone was a burden under which a far stronger candidate than Mr. Taft might have succumbed. It is the first time in the history of the country that a great panic, so far as the popular vote is concerned, has not defeated the party in power. But Mr. Bryan has been proved unsound on so many financial and economic questions in the past that the Republicans turned their own responsibility for hard times into a source of strength. Nothing contributed more to Mr. Taft's election than the belief of workingmen that his triumph would make for the restoration of prosperity, while Mr. Bryan's election would further retard good times.

For Mr. Taft personally *The World* has very high respect. While he is pledged to Mr. Roosevelt's policies,

he is not pledged to Mr. Roosevelt's violent methods. In so far as Mr. Taft shows a judicial, magisterial, independent spirit in administering the affairs of his great office we promise him emphatically the hearty support of *The World*.

We believe the country is tired of Roosevelt government by denunciation, of rough-riderism, of jingoism and of cowboy administration in general. It wants the Presidency restored to the dignity of the fathers without sacrificing any of the elements of strength and wise radicalism which made for the general welfare of the people.

It wants no Proxy in the Presidency. It wants no more personal government. It wants a rational, progressive government by due process of law, and therein lies Mr. Taft's greatest opportunity of service to his fellow-countrymen.

## CHAPTER V

### WILLIAM J. GAYNOR

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM J. GAYNOR was one of the most colorful and engaging figures in the public life of New York City and State. *The World* had more than once urged him upon the attention of the leaders of the Democratic party as fit material for a reform Governor. But he was too independent to suit the local bosses and had, himself, no liking for political activity when it might mean giving up a high place on the bench only to be defeated at the polls. Finally, however, he was persuaded to stand for Mayor by a combination of political and civic committees which promised for him an easy victory and something like an era of good feeling when elected. His crusty temper prevented such an insipid result of his election, but he had most of the qualities that make a great Mayor, capacity, courage, boldness and ingenuity. His life was shortened by the bullet of a would-be assassin.

#### JUDGE GAYNOR'S INDEPENDENCE

[October 26, 1909]

JUDGE GAYNOR's libel suit against *The World* for the publication in its evening edition of one of Mr. Brisbane's entertaining articles in behalf of Mr. Hearst is to be accepted as further proof of the Democratic candidate's militant independence.

If Judge Gaynor, in the midst of the campaign, brings suit against *The World*, which is his chief newspaper supporter, we have high hope that as Mayor he would be equally courageous in starting litigation in the public interest. That kind of a man could bring all the tax dodgers to time, collect the franchise taxes that the corporations have evaded for years and compel the traction companies to fulfill their contract obligations. That is what we want a Mayor to do.

New York needs a Mayor who is not afraid to start lawsuits against anything or anybody and who will not be swerved by personal considerations of any sort.

### A VICTIM OF DUTY

[August 10, 1910]

THE attempt upon the life of Mayor Gaynor is another startling reminder of the dangers of courageous public service. It came about through no excitement of faction nor as a result of any secret conspiracy. The act of an individual of little consequence as human units are estimated, it nevertheless directs attention very sharply to rapidly changing conditions and to tendencies in political thought that are full of peril. Seemingly, no other man was safer yesterday morning in this community than the honored Mayor of New York. Actually, he was sneakingly pursued to the ship on which he was to sail for a European holiday and shot down as might have been the victim of a vendetta. In profound sorrow for the deed and its possibilities and in sympathy for the suffering magistrate and his family but one voice can express the feelings of this people.

Elected by a party, Mayor Gaynor had become in seven months distinctively the people's magistrate. By

his fidelity, by his simplicity, by his shaping of means to ends, by his directness of purpose and by his zealous devotion to duty he had almost disarmed honest criticism. He found existing laws sufficient for his needs. From them he drew his authority, but it was he who furnished the initiative and the energy. Exercising no doubtful power, he vitalized the Mayorality, corrected abuses, inaugurated sweeping reforms and economies and gave an unmistakable impulse for good to every municipal agency. In him were centred many hopes of patriotic citizenship in a sphere much wider than that of his office. In his ripening career good men saw much that was promising for city, State and country. Following the shock which a deed like that of yesterday everywhere produces must be the solemn realization that the loss of such a man by means so foul and wanton could be regarded only as a national calamity.

There is no other tyranny like that of assassination. Despotism everywhere, it is outrageously so in a republic. It is the assertion of one man's will against the will of millions. It is absolutism that is matchless in all the bloody records of power and crime. It aims to kill not only a man but his office; to nullify not only the law but government; to change not only incumbents but systems and policies; to substitute the rule of one for the rule of the majority.

Resorted to by those having only a sordid personal grievance, assassination in its origin has aspects even more paltry in comparison with the momentous interests which it assails. When political pillage and favor become so well entrenched that an individual selfishly resists with arms in his hands the introduction of better methods damaging to himself we have an impressive illustration of the gravity of the evils with which true reformers have to contend. It is possible, furthermore, that we have in such outlawry an explanation of the timidity and ineffi-

ciency of so many men in office. They falter, perhaps, because they fear.

There is admonition also in this crime, as there has been in others, for those whose criticism of men in public life transcends the bounds of truth and justice. It is inevitable that some one must suffer from retrenchment. If the privileged few have profited under unfair policies at the expense of the many, the many, led by men like Mayor Gaynor, cannot regain their rights without depriving others of places and pelf that do not belong to them. To misrepresent this necessary process and to make it a demagogic pretext for class hatred, as if it were a contest between power and poverty, is to encourage a spirit that defies laws and shames humanity.

Governments republican in form are not instituted among men to provide them with bread and butter, with work and wages, with wealth and princely estates, but to protect them justly in their lawful industry and enterprise. To the growth of the fierce and false idea that governments, especially those of rich municipalities, are bound to care for the idle and dissolute is no doubt due in part the tragic event of yesterday. As truly as any soldier Mayor Gaynor has fallen in the line of duty, with his face to the foe.

If painful death awaits the hero of a memorable onslaught upon hereditary abuses, there should be in the American people enough of the old-time fire to demand in expiation not only the life of the wretch immediately guilty but the extinction forever of the political and social rapacity which produces him, which fed his crazy vengeance and which finally nerved his murderous arm.

WILLIAM J. GAYNOR

[September 12, 1913]

WHAT *The World* said of William J. Gaynor on the morning of Aug. 24—after Tammany had refused to renominate him for Mayor—it desires to repeat now.

"There was a note of pride and of unusual sincerity in Mayor Gaynor's proclamation to the reporters that in spite of all influence 'I have been Mayor.'

"In this Mr. Gaynor's strongest opponent would hasten to agree. He has at least been Mayor. Nobody has owned him. Nobody has controlled him. His policies have been his own policies. His mistakes have been his own mistakes. His iniquities have been his own iniquities. Whenever he has set his heel upon his own principles, it was because he wanted to, not because he was coerced.

Mentally there is no other man in the political life of New York City who can cope with him. Intellectually, Murphy and the elder statesmen of Tammany are half-grown boys in comparison with him. The corporation and traction lawyers who have dealt with him have found him an invincible ally when he was on their side and a matchless opponent if he happened to be against them.

"So far as brains and ability are to be taken into account, there was nothing humanly possible that Mayor Gaynor could not have accomplished with the government machinery that has been in his hands during the last three and a half years. New York has never had another Mayor who so thoroughly understood his trade and possessed so large a measure of administrative genius. . . .

"Had the Mayor been able to control himself as sturdily as he was able to resist control from the outside he would be a commanding figure and no political organi-

zation would dare deny him a nomination that he solicited. It may be doubted if any other man in New York's checkered history ever escaped greatness by so narrow a margin."

This, we believe, is a fair and just estimate of the political character of a very remarkable man, whose lonely and untimely death is deplored by the entire population of this city. It is no superficial or perfunctory expression of sorrow that comes from friend and foe alike, and this genuine mourning is an extraordinary tribute to a personality that gripped the interest and attention of every element in the community.

It has never been possible to measure the nervous influence that was exerted upon a naturally morbid temperament by the bullet which Mayor Gaynor carried in his throat for three years and which indirectly caused his death. This influence must have been very great, and it helps to explain much in his more recent political conduct that otherwise defies explanation. Certainly, it warped his judgment and weakened his self-control. His temperamental defects steadily thrust themselves more in evidence as the strain on his vitality increased, and the Mayor Gaynor of the last year bore only a vague and shadowy resemblance to the Mayor Gaynor of 1910.

The first year of Mayor Gaynor's term witnessed a revolution in the administration of New York affairs. If he had never done anything else, he would deserve to be remembered gratefully for this single achievement. But even in the period of storm and stress in which he earned most of the criticism that was heaped upon him, it was no small thing that the Mayor of New York should be his own master, even though he were sometimes a bad master.

The limitations of the Government of New York City furnish an unsatisfactory test of any man's qualities. The office of Mayor has been a graveyard of reputation, and



may perhaps always remain a graveyard of reputation. It is an interesting subject of speculation as to what Mayor Gaynor would have achieved on a larger stage of action with a different environment. As the record stands, he cannot be counted among the great political leaders of his generation who have profoundly influenced the course of government. He does not rank with Wilson and Roosevelt and Bryan and Hughes in prestige and power. His influence and reputation alike are circumscribed by an office that takes more than it gives, but in a long line of commonplace and slate-colored Mayors of New York he towers a giant among pigmies.

## CHAPTER VI

### CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

WITH the earlier political fortunes of Charles E. Hughes, *The World* was closely associated. By the series of articles on "Equitable Corruption," which were nearly all written by the late William McMurtrie Speer, *The World* compelled the reluctant Gov. Higgins and the equally reluctant Legislature to undertake an investigation of abuses in the life insurance business. These had become widely known through a quarrel between young James Hazen Hyde, who had inherited the controlling stock in the Equitable Life Assurance Society, and a number of men prominent in high finance, the prize of contest being the use of the millions of the policy holders in investments not always safe or profitable. On behalf of the Armstrong Legislative Committee, which was named to investigate the life insurance companies, overtures were made to know if the selection as counsel of a young lawyer, Charles E. Hughes, who had shown fine ability in the Gas Investigation, would be acceptable to *The World*. The answer was in the affirmative. The appointment followed. Mr. Hughes's success in this difficult and important inquiry made him a national figure. When in 1906 he was nominated for Governor against William Randolph Hearst by a deal with Tammany Hall, *The World* supported him. He won by 58,000 and was re-elected two years later but resigned before completing his term

to become an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. His career since then is familiar.

### YES OR NO?

[August 31, 1906]

FIRST—Is there any reason why a single Republican, except a few larcenists and lobbyists, should vote against Charles E. Hughes for Governor?

Second—Is there any doubt that tens of thousands of Independents and Democrats would vote for him?

Third—Is there any Republican, suggested or imaginable, who could receive so many votes and relatively be so sure of election as Hughes?

Fourth—Has not Mr. Higgins, whose name is the only other one mentioned on the Republican side, a weak and vulnerable record, bound to make his campaign a defensive one?

Fifth—Would not the nomination of Mr. Higgins be an extraordinary blunder, giving Mr. Hearst an excellent chance of becoming Governor whether endorsed by the regular Democrats or not?

Sixth—If Mr. Hearst received over 200,000 votes last fall in the city of New York alone, might he not, against a weak and vulnerable candidate like Higgins, and with the support of Murphy, McCarren, Tammany Hall and the regular Democratic machine, be elected?

Seventh—Is there any citizen in this great State of New York, Republican, Democrat, Socialist, organized-labor man, Prohibitionist or what not, who has an actual record of tried fitness, tried character, tried independence, tried honesty and above all, the tried ability to expose the most complicated crookedness of corporations and trusts equal to that of Mr. Hughes?

Eighth—Is there another Republican or Democrat who has proved such capacity as a lawyer, an exposé of frauds and a real reformer without shrieking or yelling or demagoguery or partisanship?

*Ninth—Who exposed the Gas Trust in this city? Who exposed Insurance Corruption? Who is the father of the most difficult, complicated, reformatory insurance-reform laws passed last winter, to prevent their becoming a dead letter like hundreds of other statutes; to purify, reorganize and reform the Insurance Department, root and branch, turning the rascals out whom Mr. Higgins has very carefully still kept in?*

Tenth—Who is there better fitted to enforce the 80-Cent Gas law in this city and continue legislation and open legal warfare, not only against the gas monopoly in this city, but to initiate through the Attorney-General and the courts proceedings to set aside the recent Ryan-Belmont merger?

Are the Republicans fools?

## FROM TILDEN TO HUGHES

[November 11, 1906]

WITH all respect to two eminent gentlemen who have left their indelible imprint upon history, it has been thirty years since a Governor of the first rank sat in the executive chamber at Albany. Is New York finally to have another in Charles E. Hughes?

There have been ten Governors of New York since Tilden was succeeded in office by Lucius Robinson only to be defrauded out of the Presidency. Two of these ten came to be Chief Magistrates of the nation. Both Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt proved to be great Presidents, but neither was a really great Governor,

and the administration of neither was remarkable for its notable achievements. Mr. Cleveland had hardly learned his trade at Albany when he became President. Mr. Roosevelt was so fearful of disturbing the heavenly harmonies of the Platt machine that he walked on tiptoe until the Easy Boss forcibly translated him to the Vice-Presidency.

Of the other chief executives since Tilden, Robinson was a good man with mediocre gifts of statecraft; Cornell's service was anything but admirable; Hill was too much occupied with machine politics to give New York the administration of which he was mentally capable; Flower and Morton were only dollar marks; Black and Odell and Higgins are too recent to require comment.

There is more similarity between Tilden and Hughes than might appear at first glance. Curiously enough, they were both elected Governor by nearly the same plurality, Tilden having 53,315 over John A. Dix. Hughes will have Democratic State officials to deal with, but a Republican Legislature. The Assembly was Democratic in Tilden's administration, but the Republicans had a majority of four in the Senate. Of the Democratic members of both house a large element was bitterly hostile to Tilden, just as a large element of the Republican Legislature will be secretly hostile to Hughes.

One of Tilden's great sources of strength was his exceptional legal ability. This is also one of Hughes's sources of strength. Tilden had had a much wider political experience than Hughes has had, but Hughes has the advantage of years, of physique and of vitality. Tilden was nearly sixty-one when he became Governor and weighed only 130 pounds. He never possessed a strong, vigorous body. Hughes is only forty-four and is capable of doing the work of two ordinary men.

Both Tilden and Hughes brought to the Governorship the closest familiarity with the practices of political

corruptionists. The system has been revolutionized in the last three decades, and the kind of knowledge that Tilden possessed would be of little value to the present-day Governor. Thirty years ago the stealing was direct from the Public Treasury. That was the Tweed method, and such were the practices which Tilden exposed both in his battle against Tweed and his subsequent fight against the Canal Ring. For example, when Tilden became Governor, he found that in the five years previous to his election the repairs on the Erie Canal had cost \$5,000,000 more than the revenue derived from tolls, and that in ten cases the State had paid \$1,560,769 for work which the contractors had agreed to do for \$425,735. Some of the members of the Legislature were themselves Canal contractors, and Denison and Belden, the leaders of the ring, had shrewdly opened and fortified every avenue of approach to the Public Treasury.

They order such things differently in these 'days. Comparatively little money is stolen directly from the Treasury. Corruption has a much more enlightened system by which corporations are secretly licensed to prey upon the public in consideration of financial and other favors accorded to office-holders and political organizations. The new powers that prey do not go to the public till. They collect the money themselves from the people by their systems of taxation which political corruption allows them to maintain.

Hughes is no less familiar with this corporation kind of criminality than Tilden was with the less subtle sort. The one learned its secrets in exposing insurance corruption as the other learned its secrets in fighting the Tweed Ring. Especially does Hughes thoroughly understand the tricks of corporations by which the public is wronged without even comprehending the method by which the wrong is committed.

Hughes is less of a politician than Tilden. He has

a narrower acquaintance among political workers, but this need not prove a handicap. Both of them achieved the Governorship by ability and force of character rather than by political manipulation. Tilden adequately described his own method in a letter to Henry Watterson written shortly after the inauguration of President Cleveland:

I depended on ideas as a political force more liberally and less on party machinery than anybody else has done. What is called patronage I never had to any appreciable extent, and yet I held my ascendancy with the Democratic masses of this State when I had to confront the adverse influence of the Executive, of the heads of the departments, of the judiciary and of the majority of both branches of the Legislature and one-third of the county leaders. I held also a majority of the votes of this State against at least 20,000 office-holders.

*The World* will be greatly disappointed if Mr. Hughes does not prove to be the ablest and best Governor New York has had since Tilden. The signs are propitious, and now that Mr. Hughes has been so lavishly congratulated on his election, it is time the State was congratulated on gaining for its highest service a man of such fitness, ability and character.

## GOV. HUGHES AND THE INCOME TAX

[January 6, 1910]

GOV. HUGHES has furnished to the opponents of the income-tax amendment the one thing they have been seeking—a plausible argument from a highly respectable source.

The Governor's objection to the amendment as submitted to the several State Legislatures for ratification

hinges upon the four words, "*from whatever source derived.*" In his opinion this would permit Congress to tax the income from State and city bonds; and "to place the borrowing capacity of the State and its governmental agencies at the mercy of the Federal taxing power would be an impairment of the essential rights of the State which as its officers we are bound to defend." Or, as the Governor says elsewhere in his message, "to permit such securities to be the subject of Federal taxation is to place such limitations upon the borrowing power of the State as to make the performance of the functions of local government a matter of Federal grace."

With all respect to Gov. Hughes, *The World* regards his fears as more imaginary than real. Assuming even that this amendment would confer upon Congress power to tax the income from State and city bonds, which is by no means certain, it is unlikely that Congress would try to exercise that power. Ever since the adoption of the Constitution Congress has had the power to levy direct taxes if it pleases, subject only to the restriction that they be apportioned among the several States according to population. As a matter of public policy, however, it has never exercised this power.

The effect of popular sentiment upon the taxing powers of Congress is stated with exceptional force by Justice Harlan in his dissenting opinion in the income-tax case, which Gov. Hughes quotes in his message: "Any attempt on the part of Congress to apportion among the States, upon the basis simply of their population, taxation of personal property or of incomes would tend to arouse such indignation among the freemen of America that it would never be repeated." In other words, the taxing power of Congress has to be exercised in accordance with the sentiment of the American people.

Members of Congress are citizens of States and residents of counties. They live in cities or villages or town-



ships, as the case may be, and most of these agencies of local government issue bonds for one purpose or another. It is hardly probable that Congressmen would pass a Federal tax law impairing the value of the public securities of the communities in which they live and for the redemption of which their own property is a pledge. But even if they did, we can assure Gov. Hughes that local self-government would not perish from the earth or become "a matter of Federal grace."

The British Government, we believe, taxes the income from its own consols, yet government in Great Britain still lives. Congress recently levied an excise tax upon the net income of all corporations doing business in the United States. If the Governor's process of reasoning is correct, all these corporations will exist as "a matter of Federal grace." When the stamp taxes were in force during the Spanish-American war Mr. Charles E. Hughes must have drawn checks against his personal bank account as "a matter of Federal grace."

All that a Federal tax on the income from city and State bonds could mean is that a slight increase might have to be made in the rate of interest, as the holders of these securities would lose some of their special privileges. If this is to be resisted as an invasion of State rights, then the Government must concede that State rights are vastly more sacred than individual rights, for no such immunity is accorded to the individual in his tax relations with the Federal Government.

It taxes the blanket he is wrapped up in when he is born. It taxes the lumber in the roof that covers his head. It taxes the food that he eats, the clothes that he wears, the coffin in which he is buried and the humble gravestone that bids him rest in peace with the hope of a glorious resurrection. All this, however, is not an invasion of State rights and hence the Governor refuses to worry about it.

*The World* does not impeach Gov. Hughes's sincerity. His declaration in favor of conferring upon Congress power to levy an income tax is clear and unequivocal. His objections are all directed against the form of the proposed amendment; but as this amendment is the only specific income-tax question before the country, the Governor for all present practical purposes might as well have declared himself against an income tax in any form.

Regardless of the distinction he makes, Gov. Hughes's message will be hailed with delight by all the interests that oppose an income tax. They will promptly fall in behind the Governor of New York to safeguard the precious principle of State rights. Wall Street is always for State rights when there is any money in it, and always believes in a strong central government when the balance of profit swings in that direction. It will turn Gov. Hughes's message, his arguments, his influence and his great reputation to its own account in every State capital in which there is a chance to prevent the ratification of the amendment.

If this amendment to the Constitution of the United States is defeated a larger measure of responsibility will rest upon Charles E. Hughes than upon any other citizen of the country—a fact to which the Governor doubtless gave careful and conscientious consideration before he sent his message to the New York Legislature.

#### AN ADMIRABLE APPOINTMENT

[April 26, 1910]

WHAT New York loses the Nation gains many times over by the appointment of Gov. Hughes to be Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. Taft could not have made a better or more popu-

lar selection. He could have found nobody capable of commanding a larger measure of professional and popular confidence. It is not merely that lawyers regard Mr. Hughes as a lawyer of the first rank, or that as Governor of New York he has shown in a very high degree the temperament of a great judge, but in every part of the country Mr. Hughes is looked upon by Republicans and Democrats alike as a progressive statesman and a fearless champion of public rights against special privilege. The choice of Mr. Hughes as the successor to Justice Brewer will go far toward restoring popular confidence in the Taft Administration.

While *The World* regrets the Governor's retirement from active politics, he will enter upon an even larger field of usefulness than any he has yet occupied. The power and influence of the United States Supreme Court have increased steadily for more than a century, and must continue to increase as the business of government becomes more complicated and the great constitutional questions presented for adjudication touch more intimately the daily lives of the American people.

There is no other branch of the Government in which a man of exceptional force and character and idealism can exert a more permanent influence upon republican institutions. Mr. Taft is looking forward to "twenty-two years of solid usefulness" on the part of Mr. Hughes as a Justice of the Supreme Court, and this "solid usefulness" may be quite as enduring as the work of a Marshall or a Story.

In these circumstances New York's loss becomes incidental and trivial. Gov. Hughes will not retire from his present office until the second week of October. By that time the record of his administration will have been practically completed. He has already taken his place as the ablest Governor New York has had since Samuel J. Tilden, and the one who has done the most toward puri-

fyng the State government and re-establishing the rule of the people.

It is an excellent thing for republican institutions that such a man should proceed from the executive chair to the Supreme Bench, to administer justice for the rest of his natural life in the same conscientious, 'dispassionate manner in which he has administered his duties as Governor of the greatest State in the Union.

### MR. HUGHES FOR CHIEF JUSTICE

[July 5, 1910]

IF public attention turns instantly to the matter of a successor to Chief Justice Fuller it implies no lack of respect for the venerable and distinguished jurist who died so suddenly yesterday. On the contrary, it is a tribute to the tremendous importance of his office in its relation to the great governmental questions of which the United States Supreme Court is the arbiter.

Almost by common consent, Gov. Hughes is accepted as the natural and logical successor to Chief Justice Fuller, and there seems to be a general understanding that Mr. Taft will appoint him. The Governor's qualifications hardly require discussion.

He is the ideal age—forty-eight, which is seven years younger than was Melville W. Fuller, when he was named for Chief Justice by President Cleveland in 1883. Only two of the Chief Justices have been younger than that—Jay, who was forty-four when he became the presiding Justice of the Court at the time of its organization, and Marshall, who was forty-six when he entered upon that wonderful career which continued for thirty-four years. While it is true that no Associate Justice has ever become Chief Justice—the nomination of Rutledge was not con-

firmed on account of mental disabilities—the precedent is without force. In the case of Gov. Hughes it is peculiarly devoid of merit, for he has not yet taken his place on the bench.

When Mr. Taft selected Mr. Hughes to succeed Justice Brewer, the President said he looked forward to "twenty-two years of solid usefulness" on the part of the newly-appointed Justice. Twenty-two years measures the exact time that Mr. Fuller was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The first Interstate Commerce law had not yet been enacted. The whole question of Federal supervision over corporations was enshrouded in mist and disputation. It has been slowly worked out by the Supreme Court during the years that Mr. Fuller was its Chief Justice, but the end is not yet reached. The most important industrial cases that the Court has yet been compelled to deal with are now before that tribunal, and its decision will make not only political history but economic and industrial history.

Surely it is not strange that even on the day of Chief Justice Fuller's death there should be general discussion as to his probable successor. To be Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court is to wield a power that no other Judge in all the world wields, and the man who holds that great office for twenty or thirty years leaves his indelible seal upon the life of the nation.

It must be counted a matter for public gratitude that the life of the venerable Chief Justice was spared until the question of a successor could be determined by a President like William H. Taft, who appreciates the responsibilities of the Federal judiciary and knows what a Judge should be. It is likewise fortunate that great lawyers like Mr. Hughes are always available, who regard a place on the bench of the United States Supreme court as the crowning achievement of a legal career.

Should Mr. Taft now make Mr. Hughes Chief Jus-

tice instead of Associate Justice the appointment would be greeted with all the manifestations of public approval that followed the original nomination. There would be general satisfaction that this greatest of legal tribunals is to have as its presiding Justice a man who has demonstrated his fitness for any office of public trust, who has proved his sympathy with the Court's best traditions and loftiest ideals.

### WHY IT IS ROOSEVELT

[April 12, 1916]

"WALL STREET is for Root, but I am for Hughes," says Gov. Whitman, who insists that Hughes "is the only man who can be elected by the party."

Of course Wall Street is for Root, but Wall Street has no expectation that Root can be nominated, and it never allows sentiment to interfere with business. That is why it will take Roosevelt, and try to float him into the White House on a sea of money.

Wall Street wants control of Congress. It wants control of the Federal Reserve Board. It wants control of the Federal Trade Board. It wants control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It wants control of the tariff-making machinery. It cannot get this through a Democratic Party led by Woodrow Wilson. It can get it through the Republican Party, and while it may despise Roosevelt personally, it is willing to accept him and support him—and finance him.

It might be ready to take Hughes, too, but Hughes is handicapped in such a way that it is almost impossible for him to obtain the nomination. Unlike the other candidates he can make no active fight for delegates. His judicial position forbids. He cannot announce his candidacy or discuss publicly any of the issues of the campaign.

While he remains on the bench his lips are sealed. He cannot say whether he is for or against the President's foreign policies, whether he is for or against preparedness, whether he is for or against more tariffs. He can say nothing.

Nor can he permit his friends to interpret his attitude toward the issues of the campaign, or to solicit support in his behalf, or to enter into any bargain for delegates.

Any other candidate could accept the nomination in the end of a long and bitter contest. Hughes could not. If he were nominated by acclamation as the unanimous choice of his party in a convention that gave free expression to the sentiment of the Republican voters, then he could honorably accept. No charge could be made that he had dragged the United States Supreme Court into the mire of politics. Mr. Choate's warning would have no force.

But Hughes cannot get the nomination under such conditions. The "favorite sons" might deliver their delegates to him. The Old Guard might take him as a choice of evils. Wall Street might decree that he was "safe and sane." But the Roosevelt elements in the convention would never vote for Hughes. Roosevelt would never permit them to vote for Hughes, and if Hughes were by chance nominated, Roosevelt would find an excuse to run against the man whom he refers to in private conversation as "that Baptist hypocrite."

So far as Hughes is concerned, the cards are stacked and the Roosevelt crowd will make sure that the nomination never comes to him on the terms in which he, as Justice of the United States Supreme Court, can acquiesce. If Hughes were ready, like Roosevelt, to take the nomination on any terms, in any circumstances, on any platform and by any arrangement, he might control the convention, but that kind of Hughes, fortunately, does not exist.

The Governor is undoubtedly sincere in his championship of the Hughes candidacy, but we have too much respect for his political intelligence to think that he believes Hughes can be nominated on terms that make acceptance possible. For practical purposes the contest is narrowing down to Root and Roosevelt. And it is needless to tell the Governor what that means. The fact of the matter is that the Republicans manufactured a crooked and fraudulent issue by their partisan attacks on the President's foreign policy, and Roosevelt promptly stole the issue. He has it and they cannot take it away from him. If they want to use it in the campaign they must come to him. They will.



## CHAPTER VII

### THE MONEY POWER

THE power of vast wealth, especially when invested in public service corporations or industries seeking national subvention, to corrupt political decisions and not seldom to fleece the investing public, reached its height in the years covered by Mr. Cobb's editorship. The passage of public service acts by the States greatly lessened one form of financial exploitation against the general interest. The War taught the nation that its railroads were essential agents of transportation that could not be permitted to operate in the old lavish ways; and the part the Government then took in managing the railroad and steamship corporations so as best to serve the national purpose has altered the public feeling upon the railroad problem in general. The railroads have fewer political enemies; and there are probably many more people who have become converted to nationalization. The reception of the Storow plan for the New England States is an astonishing evidence of the growth of sentiment in favor of public administration of railroads in a section of the country commonly considered most conservative; the regional groupings of lines contemplated by the Interstate Commerce Commission will if successfully carried out end the old days of alternating cut-throat competition and pooling agreements to "charge what the traffic will bear." If warnings are needed of what might again happen under ownership too little restricted they may be found in these discussions of past abuses.

## ONE-MAN POWER

[February 7, 1910]

THE life-insurance scandals, with the resulting investigation and legislation, checked the development of one-man power in the control and exploitation of the great New York companies. If it was dangerous to permit reckless financiers to use the resources of these corporations in their own daring adventures, as it certainly was, there can be no doubt that one man's dominant influence in the wider field of banking, transportation and industry as well as in insurance is even more to be feared.

Stock-gambling was at the bottom of the fight between Ryan and Harriman for the control of the Equitable. They wanted to use its accumulated millions in their private enterprises. They coveted its rich and persistent revenues. A splendid fund devoted to safeguarding the welfare of hundreds of thousands of homes was in their eyes of use primarily in promoting selfish ends in extending personal power.

The one-man idea was responsible also for the loot of the Metropolitan traction system, for the gigantic combine of all the local transportation facilities in Manhattan, for the millions of watered securities that have been dumped upon the public, for the accompanying inefficiency of service and for the bankruptcies and receiverships which seem to have no end. As in the case of the contest over the Equitable, the Ryan coterie acted here in complete defiance of public rights and with a greed which has had few parallels. Such safeguards as were supposed to have been thrown about the interests of the people proved to be almost valueless. What was not accomplished by mere might was made easy by the acts of dummy directors and other confederates.

In the face of these impressive examples of the ruthlessness of one-man power there has grown of late even

a greater personal dominion of the financial world. By purchase, by combination and by community of interest, there is now a J. P. Morgan power which, embracing banking and trust, insurance, industrial and transportation companies, controls or influences capital amounting to *more than six thousand millions of dollars*. It is not necessary to say that this power is abused to maintain the assertion that its exercise is altogether too great a responsibility for any individual, no matter how good or how able. Conservatively estimated, with no account of corporations in which this one man is only moderately or sympathetically interested and with no reference to the four Morgan banking-houses of New York, London, Paris and Philadelphia, the principal Morganized or partly Morganized institutions to date are as follows:

## LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

	Assets
Equitable Life Assurance Society.....	\$462,000,000
New York Life Insurance Company.....	557,000,000
	<hr/>
	\$1,019,000,000

## BANKS AND TRUST COMPANIES

	Resources
First National Bank.....	\$139,600,000
National Bank of Commerce.....	226,500,000
Mercantile Trust Company.....	68,475,000
Equitable Trust Company.....	62,800,000
Guaranty Trust Company.....	38,960,000
Astor Trust Company.....	15,200,000
Bankers Trust Company.....	53,900,000
Chase National Bank.....	107,280,000
Mechanics National Bank.....	51,360,000
National Copper Bank.....	40,300,000
Liberty National Bank.....	24,700,000
Fifth Avenue Trust Company.....	19,100,000
Standard Trust Company.....	18,450,000
	<hr/>
	\$917,625,000

## INDUSTRIALS

	Stocks	Bonds
U. S. Steel Corporation.....	\$868,809,000	\$593,231,000
Haggin-Morgan Peruvian Copper Mines .....	25,000,000	
United Dry Goods Co.....	51,000,000	
International Harvester Co.....	120,000,000	
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$1,064,809,000	\$593,231,000
		1,064,809,000
		<hr/>
		\$1,658,040,000

## RAILROAD AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES

	Stocks	Bonds
Southern Railway .....	\$179,900,000	\$228,701,000
International Mercantile Marine..	120,000,000	72,684,000
Northern Pacific .....	247,905,000	282,499,000
Great Northern .....	275,129,000	97,955,000
Reading Co. ....	140,000,000	106,654,000
Central R.R. of N. J.....	27,436,000	52,851,000
Lehigh Valley R.R.....	40,441,000	81,639,000
N. Y., N. H. and H.....	100,000,000	56,849,000
Boston and Maine.....	31,394,000	30,373,000
Hocking Valley Ry.....	26,000,000	19,912,000
Chi., G. W. R.R.....	57,015,000	28,000,000
Hudson and Manhattan R.R....	50,000,000	57,920,000
N. Y. Ont. and W. R.R.....	58,113,000	27,173,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$1,353,333,000	\$1,143,210,000
		1,353,333,000
		<hr/>
		\$2,496,543,000

## MISCELLANEOUS COMPANIES

Anglo-American Nitrate Syndicate in Chili.....	\$12,500,000
North American Company.....	29,779,000
	<hr/>
	\$42,279,000

## RECAPITULATION

Railroads, etc. ....	\$2,496,543,000
Industrials .....	1,658,040,000
Banks, etc. ....	917,625,000
Life-insurance companies .....	1,019,000,000
Miscellaneous companies .....	42,279,000
Grand Total.....	<u>\$4,133,487,000</u>

Not all of these companies are under the jurisdiction of the State of New York, but the Stock Exchange, where, in the guise of the Money Trust, they operate always daringly and sometimes disastrously, is clearly within the control of that commonwealth and may be brought within its regulating influence whenever the representatives of the people shall so elect.

A Money Trust is likely not only to make common cause with all other trusts but it may be tempted to subjugate business and industry in many branches. Dictating interest rates, it can make money cheap or dear. Controlling huge resources, it can, if it will, interfere with the natural course of markets and of distribution, manipulate bank reserves, establish confidence or destroy it, encourage new enterprises or blast them, and by vicious assaults upon credit create panic among the people and menace the Government itself. Good times or hard times, prosperity or ruin, inflation or contraction, for many people, all lie in the hollow of its plutocratic hand. Where shall this Morganizing end?

While the Money Trust is in part to blame for unchecked stock-manufacturing and stock-gambling, it is probable that the Money Trust exists chiefly on account of the possibilities that lie in the highly productive orgies of Wall Street. That is the stage upon which the latest expression of one-man power finds its most alluring activities. If the special privileges which the law has thrown about the Stock Exchange were repealed; if gambling

there and usury there were treated as they are elsewhere; if wash sales and other dishonest tricks by brokers were punished, and if banks subject to State control were held to a stricter account for their misuse of 'depositors' money, even the Money Trust, bowing to the will of one far-seeing and far-reaching man, would be shorn of much of its capacity for mischief.

To these ends Gov. Hughes can contribute powerfully by urging upon the Legislature the adoption of the alternative recommendation of the Wall Street commission that the Stock Exchange be incorporated and subjected to State authority and supervision. With State power asserted, one-man power must decline. With State supervision in force, the more manifest evils of stock-gambling, stock-watering and the defenses which have been thrown about them must disappear.

The Morganized plutocracy presumes upon the indifference and the inefficiency of the State. It undertakes to dictate in finance, in industry and in government. To meet and defeat this assumption there must be an impressive assertion of popular authority, so energetic as to command respect and so just and wise as to disarm reasonable criticism.

J. PIERPONT MORGAN

[April 1, 1913]

FINANCIAL feudalism died in the United States when Woodrow Wilson took the oath of office as President. Now comes the death of J. Pierpont Morgan, who was the most commanding figure in that feudalism.

He was the last of his line. There will not be another J. Pierpont Morgan. Never again will such power as Mr. Morgan exerted over money and credit and pros-

perity be concentrated in the hands of a single individual. Never again will conditions of government make it possible for any financier to bestride the country like a Colossus.

Even Mr. Morgan waited until he was nearly sixty for the opportunities that made him a master of money. These opportunities were finally achieved through partnership with government. After the triumph of Han-naism in 1896 this country was given over to Wall Street to be exploited like a conquered province. The welfare of Wall Street was made the national welfare. The law of the Stock Exchange became the law of the land, all statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.

Out of the welter of politics and plutocracy emerged J. Pierpont Morgan, who was known nationally only by his operations as a gold-broker for the Cleveland Administration. Having greater force, greater character, greater intellect and greater vitality than any other man in Wall Street he naturally became the leader, and he remained the leader. No other banker or financier knew so well what he wanted to do or how to do it. None other could command the kind of confidence that Mr. Morgan could command. Mr. Morgan did not always see far, but he saw further than anybody else in Wall Street, and in the realms of the blind the one-eyed man is king.

What Mr. Morgan knew was that this is a country of almost inexhaustible resources, and that the industry and ingenuity and productiveness of the American people are well-nigh inexhaustible. He believed in them, and believed in them sincerely. It was a form of patriotism with him, and a very intense patriotism. He believed in the United States, just as he believed that power belonged to him who could seize it and use it.

In all of Mr. Morgan's great operations he worked in partnership with government. He was no gigantic

figure stalking alone in gloomy solitude. His first great bond operations were under the auspices of the Cleveland Administration. His organization of the Steel Trust was viewed sympathetically by a McKinley Administration that nullified the Sherman law for his benefit. When he performed the herculean labors that stopped the Roosevelt panic in 1907 he did it with money from the United States Treasury. When government forsook him, as in the Northern Securities case, he failed. When it confronted him, as in the Money Trust investigation, it shattered his strength.

The great interlocking system of banks, industries and credit which he did so much to create could exist only by the favor of government. On the industrial side this system capitalized the failure of the National Government to enforce the Sherman law and the failure of the State Governments to safeguard the organization of corporations. On the financial side it capitalized the currency and banking laws which centralized all the free money in New York, and the insurance laws which placed the savings of the American people at the bidding of high finance. It was Mr. Morgan who consolidated and unified this financial oligarchy.

If mere money is to have a free hand in exploiting a country, this country was fortunate indeed in having J. Pierpont Morgan at the head of its unofficial financial system. No man clothed with irresponsible, autocratic power could be expected to wield it more honorably or ably or patriotically than he. But the system itself is impossible. No free people could long tolerate it and remain a free people.

Mr. Morgan should be regarded, perhaps, as a link between the financial barbarism of the Gould-Fisk régime, and the financial democracy which is the next great promise of the Republic. A halt has already come in the business of exploitation. Even Mr. Morgan's power was



rapidly waning as government came more and more to assert its sovereignty over plutocracy. The system which he built up with so much skill and effort is doomed to crumble. The Morgan empire is one that the satraps cannot govern and will not be permitted to govern. In time little will remain except the feeling of bewilderment that a self-ruling people should ever have allowed one man to wield so much power for good or evil over their prosperity and general welfare, however much ability and strength and genius that man possessed.

#### A CHAPTER OF FINANCIAL INFAMY

[February 1, 1914]

THE WORLD today undertakes to show what becomes of the \$12,000,000 of money belonging to the stockholders of the New Haven which according to Chairman Prouty of the Interstate Commerce Commission "vanished into the air."

Needless to say, this money did not vanish "into the air." It vanished into the coffers of J. P. Morgan & Co. It was taken out of the treasury of the New Haven by Mr. Morgan and his associates to recompense J. P. Morgan & Co. for loans they had made practically without security to a dummy corporation organized to conceal various financial manipulations in connection with the construction of the Westchester road. Even the exposure of the life insurance corruption revealed no more cold-blooded piece of Wall Street piracy than the transaction whose scaly history is printed elsewhere in today's issue of *The World*.

Whoever wishes to know how the stockholders of a great railroad company can be swindled, robbed and ruined by the process of law is invited to study carefully

the steps by which the Westchester road was unloaded upon the unfortunate New Haven after President Mellen had informed the New Haven directors that the Westchester stock was worth "about ten cents a pound." Whoever wishes to understand the cold, calculated villainy by which the New Haven has been bled white and its helpless stockholders cheated of the dividends which represent the only means of support that thousands of them have, is invited to study this chronicle of "high finance" to the last, least line.

If J. P. Morgan and his associates had gone into the offices of the New Haven and blown open the safe and stuffed these millions into their pockets, they would have been guilty of burglary. But what a burglar might have done personally and defiantly they accomplished by stealth and cunning. In the long run, the New Haven would have been better off if they had stolen this money outright from its safe, for then it would not have been saddled with the continuing burden of the Westchester which is a steady drain upon its resources.

Thousands of men are in jail for offenses against society which are picayunish in comparison with this stupendous achievement in respectable robbery. It would be bad enough if the Westchester transaction stood by itself; but it is only one link in a long chain of financial infamy by which one of the largest railroad systems in the country was sold into slavery.

Mr. Morgan is dead, but his estate is not dead. His executors still hold the tainted profits that were acquired in this transaction, and the courts are open to the New Haven stockholders to sue for restitution. Mr. Morgan is beyond the reach of the law, but his associates, who are still living, are not beyond the reach of the law. Guilt in their case is still personal and if they cannot be punished under any State statute for the grosser offenses, these offenses were nevertheless part of the violation of the

Sherman Anti-Trust law to which the New Haven as a corporation has confessed. Whatever measure of mercy and immunity is shown toward the corporation there should be neither mercy nor immunity for directors who participated in the colossal swindles by which the New Haven has been brought to the verge of bankruptcy. Here is the time, place and occasion for the Wilson administration to erect its gibbet of shame and prove again that the criminal statutes of the United States know neither rich nor poor.

There can be no "Constitution of peace" with Piracy and Plunder.

### THE END OF A MYTH

[June 7, 1914]

OUT of the welter of New Haven corruption one great fact stands unchallenged—the J. Pierpont Morgan theory of finance is as dead as the Mark Hanna theory of government. Neither can be resurrected.

From 1896 to 1912 may be termed the Age of Myth in American history. This Myth was economic and financial. Certain men in Wall Street, chief of whom was the late J. Pierpont Morgan, conceived the idea that they could organize, combine and capitalize the industrial life of the American people into a vast monopoly which they would control and exploit for their own profit. In the midst of a political republic they purposed to erect a Roman empire of finance which should not only govern money and industry and transportation, but should govern Government.

In order to carry out their program it was necessary that they should have a powerful political agent in sympathy with their plans and purposes. This agent they

had found in Mark Hanna. The free silver craze had not only put the Republican party in possession of the Federal Government but it had put Mark Hanna in possession of the Republican party.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Morgan both believed that the country should be governed by property and that the power over both property and Government should be centralized. Mr. Hanna knew how to turn money into government. Mr. Morgan knew how to turn government into money. The partnership was perfect for its purposes. Only one thing was forgotten—the American people. Apparently, it never occurred to either Mr. Hanna or Mr. Morgan that the things they set out to do were contrary to all the experience and traditions of the English-speaking races.

Hannaism died a lingering death, but it died, root, branch and twig. With the election of Woodrow Wilson to the Presidency in 1912 the last spark of life had vanished. Outside of the select circles of Privilege there were no mourners. The American voters of all parties by practically unanimous consent, had decreed that they would not tolerate an administration of Government by the brute force of money.

Morganism had received its death blow long before Hannaism expired, but it held on during Mr. Morgan's lifetime. The superstition still prevailed in Wall Street that there could be a Superman of Finance who was not only omnipotent but infallible and omniscient. That superstition has been exploded once for all by the New Haven investigation. In spite of his mastery of banking, his great financial reputation and his domination over his associates, Mr. Morgan accomplished about the same results for the New Haven that a couple of crooked stock jobbers once accomplished for the Erie. When it came to the actual management of a vast transportation property, Mr. Morgan proved to have about as much talent

and judgment as Jim Fisk or Jay Gould. Any division superintendent on the New Haven would have been a wiser and better guardian of the property.

This came about not because Mr. Morgan was calculatingly corrupt like Fisk and Gould, but because he was trying to do something that could not be done. The more he tried to do it the deeper he floundered, until eventually he had dragged one of the richest railroad properties in the world into the quicksands of bankruptcy.

Mr. Morgan was essentially a banker, and no great railroad system was ever built up by a banker. No great railroad system was ever successfully operated by a banker. Bankers may be useful in floating railroad securities, but the floating of securities is only incidental to the main purposes of a railroad, however vital it is to the main purposes of a banker.

But the wreck of the New Haven is not due merely to the fact that the board of directors was dominated by Mr. Morgan and that Mr. Morgan was a banker with a myriad of different interests. It was due to the fact that Mr. Morgan's theory of monopoly was fundamentally and radically unsound. To achieve such monopoly meant a reckless and scandalous expenditure of money that no corporation could maintain. It meant as well the debauching of public opinion, the corruption of government, the suppression of all the political and economic instincts of 100,000,000 people and a permanent defiance of the laws of the United States. Only a generation of Wall Street Bourbons could have believed it possible or have known so little about the American people as to think they would permit it.

Mr. Morgan's structure of monopoly began to crumble rapidly with the life insurance investigation. The New Haven investigation leaves it in ruins. The monopoly madness is ended.

Other masterful political corruptionists may arise, but

there will be no other Mark Hanna. The laws governing campaign contributions and the laws regulating nominations and elections have made a revival of Hannanism impossible. Other masterful financiers may arise in Wall Street, but there will be no other J. Pierpont Morgan. The new Banking and Currency law has destroyed the conditions under which a Morgan was possible.

The economic theory of monopoly has followed the economic theory of slavery to its grave. Both were tolerated for a time. Both had powerful defenders. But both were at war with the traditions and genius of the American people, and both were destroyed. The collapse of the New Haven marks the last attempt that will be made within the lifetime of this political generation at least to bring a rich and populous section of the United States under the yoke of a financial despotism.

Mr. Morgan was a strong man in Wall Street. But no man is as strong as First Principles.

## NEW HAVEN CORRUPTION

[July 14, 1914]

ALL the charges made by *The World* against the Morgan-Rockefeller domination of the New Haven Railroad are substantiated and confirmed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Not since the life insurance investigation have there been revelations of such stupendous financial corruption. "*A reasonable estimate of the loss to the New Haven by reason of waste and mismanagement will amount to between \$60,000,000 and \$90,000,000.*"

As the Commission says in its report:

The result of our research into the financial workings of the former management of the New Haven has been to dis-

close one of the most glaring instances of misadministration in all the history of American railroading.

In ten years, from June 30, 1903, the capitalization of the New Haven was increased from \$93,000,000 to \$417,000,000, an addition of \$324,000,000. Of this increase only \$120,000,000 was spent on the railroad itself. The other \$204,000,000 "was expended for operation outside of the railroad sphere." As the Commission truly says:

The difficulties under which this railroad system has labored in the past are internal and wholly due to its own mismanagement. Its troubles have not arisen because of regulation by government authority. Its greatest losses and most costly blunders were made in attempting to circumvent governmental regulation and to extend its domination beyond limits fixed by the law.

The fruits of this Morgan monopoly madness cannot better be described than in the Commission's own words:

This investigation has demonstrated that the monopoly theory of those controlling the New Haven was unsound and mischievous in its effects. To achieve such monopoly meant the reckless and scandalous expenditure of money: It meant the attempt to control public opinion; corruption of government; the attempt to pervert the political and economic instincts of the people in insolent defiance of the law.

Through exposure of the methods of this monopoly the invisible government which has gone far in its efforts to dominate New England has been made visible. It has been clearly proved how public opinion was distorted; how officials who were needed and could be bought were bought; how newspapers that could be subsidized were subsidized; how a college professor and publicist secretly accepted money from the New Haven while masking as a representative of a great American university and as guardian of the people; how agencies of information to the public were prostituted in order to carry out a scheme of private transportation monopoly imperial in its scope.

And what of the directors who permitted the erection of this colossal system of corruption? "It is inconceivable," says the Commission, "that these wrongs would have gone on without interference if the members of the Board of Directors had been true to the faith they owed the stockholders." It is likewise true, as the Commission asserts, that "none of the directors would have been so careless in the handling of his own money," as were the highly respectable Morgan-Rockefeller dummies in dealing with the money of the New Haven stockholders whose interests they were supposed to protect and guard. "Criminal negligence" is a mild term with which to characterize their conduct.

There can be no honest dissent from the conclusions of the Commission:

The revelations of this record made it essential for the welfare of the Nation that the reckless and profligate financing which has blighted this great railroad system be ended, and that until this is fully done there will be no assurance that the story of the New Haven will not be told again with the stockholders of some other road as the victims.

This report is an appeal for civil suits for restitution. It is an appeal for criminal prosecution where the statute of limitations has not yet intervened. It is an appeal to all the agencies of law and justice that can intervene to use their powers to right the gigantic wrongs that have been committed in the name of finance and transportation. It is an appeal for legislation that will put the stamp of open criminality upon the practices which have all but wrecked one of the richest railroad companies in the world.

This appeal should not be made in vain.

The New Haven was looted under the personal auspices of men who were supposed to represent the loftiest financial integrity of Wall Street. It was looted



under the auspices of men who posed as the great captains of American finance. Yet under the direction of Morgan and Rockefeller the New Haven shared practically the fate of the Erie under Fisk and Gould. In its madness for monopoly the so-called integrity of Wall Street produced substantially the same results as the most cunning rascality of Wall Street produced a generation ago.

Not only that, but did the crookedness of Fisk and Gould ever resort to more devious ways to conceal the truth than that to which the respectable Morgan-Rockefeller combination resorted? Let the commission tell the story:

It was found in the investigation of the New Haven system that there were 336 subsidiary corporations, and the books of the New Haven road proper reflect only a small part of the financial transactions of the railroad. Many of these subsidiary corporations served no purpose save an evil one. They were used to cover up transactions that would not bear scrutiny, and to keep from the eyes of public officials matters that were sought to be kept secret.

Wall Street for months has been screaming against "government by investigation." Is Wall Street prepared to stand by the record of the New Haven case and to maintain that it is essential to the prosperity of the American people that such iniquity must not be exposed, much less punished?

Wall Street for months has been denouncing the Administration's proposals for Government supervision over the securities of railroads, as "political control" of great corporations. Has political control anything more scandalous to its discredit than the Morgan-Rockefeller control of the New Haven? Would it be possible even in Tammany Hall to find a more devious trail of crookedness and corruption than that which the Interstate Com-

merce Commission has been following from the offices of the New Haven?

There can be no Constitution of Peace with men who practice grand larceny and call it finance. There can be no Constitution of Peace with men who practice burglary and call it business.

The trouble with this country today is not in the policies of the Administration. It is in the practices of men of wealth, education and understanding who hesitate at nothing to gain power and profit. Prosperity is excellent in itself, but there are better things than prosperity. Honesty is better. Justice is better. Liberty is better. There could be neither honesty nor justice nor liberty in a country that submitted to the dictation of such a corrupt Plutocracy as that which has defied law, 'debauched government, polluted public opinion, defrauded the weak and helpless and plundered a great property in a conspiracy to enthrone Monopoly.

### A TIME TO ACT

[November 22, 1916]

THERE is no more complete grant of power under the Constitution than that which authorizes Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States."

It is a power that has been sparingly used, but it is a power that is none the less absolute. Railroad managers and railroad employees are equally mistaken if they think they can trifle with it. Nothing is needed to call it into full use except the insistent demand of a militant public opinion.

It is true that Congress cannot compel individuals to invest their money in railroad securities; but with a guar-

antee of honest capitalization and honest management, there is little need of worry on that score. Money will flow almost automatically into railroad investment whenever there is opportunity.

It is true that Congress cannot compel individuals to work on railroads except by an exercise of military power; but Congress can say under what circumstances organizations of railroad employees may quit and under what circumstances they may not quit. They have no natural right of organization except as society, acting through Government, permits or assents to it. The privileges of organization may be restricted as the general welfare may demand.

If it is necessary in the regulation of railroads engaged in interstate commerce to sweep away the whole fabric of State control, it should be swept away. There is no issue of State rights involved in the controversy, because the States have no rights so far as Interstate commerce is concerned. They never had any rights. From the day the Constitution was adopted, the Interstate Commerce clause meant just what it means now, that the failure of Congress to exert its full authority conferred no additional authority upon the several States.

What Mr. Bryan once happily described as "the twilight zone" between National and State authority does not exist in respect to interstate commerce except as Congress has allowed it to exist. There is no twilight zone but the legislative power of the National Government cannot obliterate whenever it chooses.

Congress has proceeded slowly and cautiously in the exercise of its authority over interstate commerce and so far as railroad service is concerned, the country is the worse off because of this delay and hesitation. The time has come for another long step forward in the exercise of these constitutional powers. That step involves the emancipation of the railroads from State interference,

the emancipation of investors from crooked financiering, the emancipation of the public from strikes and lockouts and a general reorganization of railroad traffic under the direction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is a stupendous undertaking, but it ought to be done now. When the war is ended and the United States is confronted with the new industrial problems that must inevitably grow out of it the country ought not to be handicapped by an antiquated system of railroad regulation which leaves the transportation of 100,000,000 people subject to the meddling of forty-eight State Governments and to the recurrent anarchy of capital and labor.

The danger was never more clearly revealed than it has been during the last six months, and the remedy was never more apparent.

## CHAPTER VIII

### WOODROW WILSON

As early as 1906 Joseph Pulitzer, in the course of some general instructions to his editorial writers, suggested that the United States might wisely elect as President a man of the type of Dr. Eliot of Harvard, whom he greatly admired. "Woodrow Wilson," he added, "of course also comes up to the standard, a scholar and a thinker." *The World* sympathetically watched Mr. Wilson's fight for democracy as a college president in Princeton and his career as Governor of New Jersey; and it went beyond its usual course by nominating him for the Presidency in advance of the Baltimore Convention of 1912. That convention, it will be remembered, adjourned over Sunday without a choice. Monday morning, with an emphasis of type display unusual in its columns, appeared in *The World* Mr. Cobb's famous "No Compromise" editorial. This article had much to do with ending the deadlock by the nomination of Mr. Wilson. As President Mr. Wilson highly valued Mr. Cobb's judgment and advice. *The World* was generally found in support of his policies and ideals.

FOR PRESIDENT—WOODROW WILSON!

[May 30, 1912]

WOODROW WILSON of New Jersey should be the Democratic candidate for President.

That is the opinion of *The World*. That is the counsel of the New Jersey primaries. That is the logic of the situation.

It is time for facts and not for theories. Judson Harmon might prove a strong candidate in New York and Ohio, but his nomination has been rendered impossible. Champ Clark would be a hopelessly beaten candidate in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. He could do no better than Mr. Bryan, who has lost these States three times and would lose them again if nominated. Oscar W. Underwood is of Presidential size, but he has been untested as a candidate in the North and is an unknown quantity to most of the voters. Woodrow Wilson alone has a record of continuing victory in the section in which victory is essential to Democratic success.

What other Democratic candidate could poll so many votes in the great debatable States of the East—New York, New Jersey and Connecticut?

What other Democratic candidate, who could carry these States, would be so strong in the great debatable States of the Middle West—Ohio and Indiana?

What other Democratic candidate could make so powerful an appeal to hundreds of thousands of thoughtful independent voters without whose support no Democratic President can be elected?

What other Democratic candidate could so well stem the rising tide of Rooseveltism, which now threatens to engulf representative government and republican institutions?

What other Democratic candidate would so fully measure up to the ideals of the sane radicals and the sane conservatives upon whose joint action the result of the election will hinge?

*The World* hitherto has withheld its active support from all candidates. It advocated an open convention at

Baltimore, and advised its Democratic friends to await the action of the Republicans at Chicago. The open convention is assured. The measure of all the candidates has been taken. The situation is clarified and further delay is unnecessary.

Like a twentieth-century Genghis Khan, Theodore Roosevelt, with his horde of prairie Populists and Wall Street socialists, is sweeping down upon the Republican National Convention. Mr. Taft seems as powerless to check him as the degenerate Romans were to check the descent of the Goths and the Vandals. The historic party of Lincoln and Seward and Chase and Sumner and Conkling and Chandler and Blaine and Garfield and Harrison and Sherman and McKinley is apparently in the death throes. This is the twilight of the gods and the Democratic party must rise not only to its opportunity but to its responsibility.

How can it do its duty better than to match sanity against lunacy; statesmanship against demagoguery; the historian against the Rough Rider; the educator of public opinion against the debaucher of public opinion; the first term against the third term; the tariff-reformer against the stand-patter; the man who would prosecute trust magnates against the man who protects trust magnates; the man with clean hands against the man who draws his campaign fund from Wall Street; the supporter of constitutional government against the champion of personal government; law against lawlessness; Americanism against Mexicanism; the Republic against the dictatorship?

Who better represents these issues than Woodrow Wilson? Who is better qualified than Woodrow Wilson to appeal to the intelligence and common sense of the American people against the most cunning and adroit demagogue that modern civilization has produced since Napoleon III?

Who would stand a better chance of election in this great national crisis?

Let us look at the facts:

It will require 266 electoral votes to elect a President. The so-called Southern States, including Maryland and Missouri, have 175 votes. Assuming that Arizona will go Democratic too, practically any Democratic candidate for President can count on 178 electoral votes. But 88 more are necessary to victory. Where can these 88 be found?

It is folly to look for them west of the Mississippi River. The West is in the midst of another revival of Populism. In Theodore Roosevelt it has found a new substitute for its gospel of free silver. He is the political reincarnation of James B. Weaver, Mary E. Lease, Jerry Simpson and Peffer. He is the heaven-born ratio of 16 to 1 in a still more fascinating form. It is idle to think that any Democrat could appeal to the West against Roosevelt. It is idle to think that anybody who is not a far more masterful and dangerous demagogue than Roosevelt could command the support of the Populists who now call themselves Republican Progressives.

During Gov. Wilson's public career, *The World* has been compelled to take issue with him on many questions. We regarded with grave misgiving his sudden conversion to the initiative and referendum, reversing the principles of a life-time. We regretted his apparent disposition to imitate Mr. Bryan's sweeping charge against the so-called Money Trust without supporting these charges with facts and specifications. We regretted his long campaign tours, his too eager chase after the nomination, and certain symptoms of instability which threatened to weaken his public usefulness. We have not hesitated to warn him when we thought he was going astray, and shall not hesitate to do so again in the future.

But Gov. Wilson's elements of weakness are vastly



overbalanced by his elements of strength. He has proved his political courage and his fearlessness. He has proved himself sound on tariff reform. He has proved himself sound on the Sherman law. He has proved himself sound on corporation control. He has proved himself sound against government by Wall Street plutocracy. He has proved himself sound on the independence of the judiciary. He has proved himself sound on the fundamental principles of constitutional government. He has proved that he is instinctively and temperamentally a Democrat. He has proved himself a free man who cannot be bulldozed by bosses or influenced against his convictions even by his personal friends. That is the sort of man who ought to be President.

Gov. Wilson has had more public experience than Grover Cleveland had when he was elected President. He is better known to the rank and file of the party than Samuel J. Tilden was when he was nominated for President. *The World* believes that he would be a progressive constitutional President whom the American people could trust and for whom they would never have cause to apologize.

We appeal to all Democrats to consider this matter soberly and thoughtfully and without prejudice. We appeal to the delegates to the Democratic National Convention to be swayed by no considerations except those of principle and the public welfare. We appeal to Mr. Bryan to throw his great political influence upon the side of Gov. Wilson and aid the Democratic party to meet adequately this great crisis in the Nation's history. He has the most brilliant opportunity for disinterested, patriotic leadership that has come to any American in this generation, and he has before him in Theodore Roosevelt a striking example of the meaning of ruthless and unyielding ambition.

It is not in behalf of Woodrow Wilson that *The*

*World* urges his nomination. It is not merely in behalf of the Democratic party as a party. It is in behalf of the American people. It is in behalf of American institutions. It is in behalf of the Republic. It is in behalf of the Nation that is now confronted with the gravest menace that it has faced since the obliteration of human slavery and the overthrow of secession.

WILSON—NO COMPROMISE WITH RYAN AND MURPHY!

[July 1, 1912]

It is too late to talk compromise at Baltimore.

Ryanism and Murphyism have created an issue that makes the nomination of Woodrow Wilson a matter of Democratic life or death.

To compromise now is for the Democratic National Convention to surrender to Thomas F. Ryan.

To compromise now is for the Democratic National Convention to surrender to August Belmont.

To compromise now is for the Democratic National Convention to surrender to Charles F. Murphy.

To compromise now is for the Democratic National Convention to surrender to Wall Street.

To compromise now is for the Democratic National Convention to surrender to Tammany Hall.

To compromise now is to send a Democratic ticket into the campaign shackled to bossism and plutocracy.

To compromise now is to give Theodore Roosevelt the supreme issue that he needs.

Compromise was possible until the Ryan-Murphy conspiracy was fully revealed and the Tammany boss carried out the terms of his bargain with the Clark managers by throwing New York's ninety votes to Champ Clark. Compromise was possible until Mr. Bryan was compelled

by the inexorable logic of events to repudiate Champ Clark's candidacy and vote for Woodrow Wilson. Compromise was possible until it became apparent to every intelligent man that the Ryan-Murphy-Belmont-Hearst coalition had set out to strangle progressive Democracy, destroy Mr. Bryan politically and prevent the nomination of Woodrow Wilson at any cost.

Compromise is no longer possible. There can be no Democratic harmony, there can be no Democratic unity, there can be no Democratic integrity, until the convention overwhelms this shameful alliance between corrupt finance and corrupt politics.

It is the duty of Mr. Bryan to stand fast in his support of Gov. Wilson, and it is the duty of true Democrats to stand fast in their support of Mr. Bryan. Whatever their differences with him in the past, he is fighting today the battle of honest Democracy, he is fighting the battle of the American people, and he is fighting it manfully and magnificently.

The Ryan-Murphy coalition will now accept anybody except Wilson. If the convention yields to the plea for a compromise candidate, it will be a Ryan-Murphy victory.

A thousand Roosevelt orators will be thundering from the stump their denunciation of Democracy's surrender to Wall Street.

A thousand Taft orators will be thundering from the stump their denunciation of Democracy's surrender to Wall Street.

The issue that is vital to Roosevelt's campaign for a third term will come to his hand ready made. The Democratic party might as well retire from the contest as to go before the country with the Ryan-Murphy taint upon its ticket.

This is no longer a question of Woodrow Wilson's political strength, great as that is. It is no longer a ques-

tion of his ability, undeniable as that is. It is no longer a question of his availability, self-evident as that is. Ryan and Murphy have left honest Democrats no choice. Ryan and Murphy have left honest Democrats no alternative. Ryan and Murphy have made Wilson's nomination the crucial test of the Democratic party's fitness to live.

As Stephen A. Douglas once said, "There can be no neutrals in this war—only patriots or traitors."

## A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM

[July 3, 1912]

THE nomination of Woodrow Wilson for President means a new Democracy. It means a new epoch in American self-government.

The Democratic party at last has broken its shackles. It has emancipated itself. It has rehabilitated itself in power and principle. It has turned its face to the rising sun, to re-establish the faith of the American people in their own institutions.

Woodrow Wilson will be the next President of the United States. But he will be more than that. He will be the first President of the United States in a generation to go into office owing favors to nobody except the American people and under obligation to nothing except the general welfare.

No political boss brought about his nomination. No political machine carried his candidacy to victory. No coterie of Wall Street financiers provided the money to finance his campaign. He has no debt to pay to corrupt politics or to corrupt business. He was nominated by the irresistible force of public opinion, and by that alone. He stands before the country a free man.

The American people have set out to regain posses-

sion of their government, and Woodrow Wilson was nominated for President because he embodies that issue. The bosses and the plutocrats who tried to prevent his nomination were beaten by the power of the people, and the power that nominated him is the power that will elect him.

With Woodrow Wilson as the Democratic candidate for President it makes no difference what Roosevelt does. It makes no difference how many third parties he organizes. Progressive Democrats and progressive Republicans now have a candidate of their own. The contest between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft is now a contest for the control of the Republican organization, and nothing more. The menace of a third term no longer hangs over the country. The menace of personal government no longer threatens American institutions. The United States is not to be Mexicanized. It is to be re-Americanized.

It is because Gov. Wilson represents this vital principle that *The World* so persistently urged his nomination. It is because Gov. Wilson represents this principle that the opposition within the party was forced to surrender. It is because Gov. Wilson represents this principle that he will be triumphantly elected in November. Such a man is imperatively needed, and the American people, true to their traditions in every crisis, have again found him.

Gov. Wilson's nomination means that the rule of the boss is over. It means that the partnership between corrupt politics and corrupt business in national politics is forcibly dissolved. It means that the old régime of protection to Privilege and Plutocracy is on the scaffold. It means that the old gods are dead.

The United States is back to the benediction pronounced by Abraham Lincoln on the battlefield of Gettysburg—"that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by

*the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."*

## A SPEECH THAT WILL LIVE

[August 8, 1912]

WOODROW WILSON's speech of acceptance is the ablest, clearest, sanest statement of high public purpose this country has known in a generation.

Without passion, without invective, without abuse, without partisan bitterness, without denunciation, without egotism, without demagoguery, he has driven straight to the heart of the supreme issue of American institutions—the partnership between Government and Privilege.

Every great conflict within the lifetime of the Republic has hinged upon this one question. Every great reform marking a milestone in the political progress of the American people has forced the dissolution of such a partnership.

Federalism was destroyed under the leadership of Jefferson because Federalism had become a partnership between the Government and a small class of property-owners.

The Democratic party swept into power under Jackson because the Government had entered into partnership with the United States Bank and its financial allies.

Under Lincoln the Republican party obliterated the partnership of Government and slave-owners in "the mightiest struggle and the most glorious victory as yet recorded in human annals."

It was the Government's partnership with a shameless plutocracy which rehabilitated the Democratic party under the leadership of Tilden. Because of the Government's long partnership with Privilege under the McKinley, Roosevelt and Taft Administrations we are face to

face with the old issue in a new form. Again we have what Gov. Wilson rightly describes as "an awakened Nation impatient of partisan make-believe."

Of all the candidates for President, Woodrow Wilson alone meets this issue frankly and sincerely. The Republican party under Mr. Taft still holds to its ancient partnership with the beneficiaries of extortionate tariffs. The Progressive party under Mr. Roosevelt frankly purpose to maintain a perpetual partnership between the Government and the trusts. But the Democratic party under Woodrow Wilson has set forth to re-establish a partnership between the Government and the People, and this is the one adequate solution of the whole problem.

It applies to every issue of the campaign, as Gov. Wilson shows in his speech of acceptance; to the tariff, to the trusts, to the high cost of living, to the money power, to campaign funds, to currency reform, to conservation, to representative government in all its forms. It can all be brought about without the change of a single syllable of the Organic Law, without the overturning of a single institution handed down to us by the Fathers for the perpetuation of a free Nation.

The tariff is not merely a political matter or an economic matter. It is also a question of morals. It is one thing when the Government maintains tariffs to encourage industry. It is quite another thing when industry maintains tariffs to debauch Government and oppress the people. As Gov. Wilson says: "Tariff schedules have been made up for the purpose of keeping as large a number as possible of rich and influential manufacturers in good humor with the Republican party, which desired their financial support." This is the beginning and the end of it. The Republican party for a generation has been selling tariff schedules for campaign contributions and it is powerless to dissolve the partnership that it has created.

This partnership can now be destroyed only by immediate revision "downward and unhesitatingly downward," beginning "with the schedules which have been used most obviously to kill competition and to raise prices in the United States arbitrarily," and extending to "every item in every schedule which affords any opportunity for monopoly, for special advantage to limited groups of beneficiaries or for subsidized control of any kind in the markets or enterprises of the country."

That is tariff reform without ifs, ands or buts. That is tariff reform about which there can be no honest partisan difference. That is tariff reform in the interests of the people and not of the contributors to the campaign fund. That is Government in partnership with Privilege.

The same vicious system that is responsible for tariff extortion is largely responsible for the high cost of living. "*The high cost of living is arranged by private understanding,*" as Gov. Wilson truly says. The same vicious system is responsible for the trusts and for all the evils that they represent. "The trusts do not belong to the period of infant industries." On the contrary, "they belong to a very recent and sophisticated age when men knew what they wanted and knew how to get it by the favor of Government."

The same vicious system is responsible for the so-called money power; for "the vast confederacies" of banks and railroads and express companies and insurance companies and manufacturing companies, all banded together by small and closely related boards of directors. "There is nothing illegal about these confederacies" which are now "part of our problem." They have never wanted anything from the Government except immunity from interference, and they know how to get that.

And so the story runs. There is not a vital issue confronting the country that does not go back to this alliance between Government and Privilege. There is not an



issue, however complicated, that cannot be settled by what Gov. Wilson calls "the rule of justice and right." There is not an issue that cannot be disposed of by what he calls "an unentangled Government, a Government that cannot be used for private purposes, either in the field of business or in the field of politics; a Government that will not tolerate the use of the organization of a great party to serve the personal aims and ambitions of any individual, and that will not permit legislation to be employed to further any private interest."

The spirit of this speech is the spirit of the preamble of the Constitution. "To form a more perfect Union" by dissolving the private partnerships with Government which lead to disunion. "To establish justice" by destroying the Government favoritism that is the essence of injustice. "To insure domestic tranquillity" by obliterating the special privileges that are an incitement to revolt. "To provide for the common defense" by strengthening the faith of the people in the integrity of their institutions. "To promote the general welfare" by keeping the door of opportunity open to all. "The Republic is opportunity," said Garfield. When it ceases to be opportunity we shall no longer have a Republic.

It is the high mission of Woodrow Wilson to be the leader of the American people in this contest to regain possession of their own institutions. Many candidates have rendered lip-service to the sentiments which he utters, but the vitalizing element is his own character and his own record of public service. As Governor of New Jersey he has made his deeds square with his words. As President of the United States, owing his nomination wholly to the favor of the people and election wholly to the favor of the people, who can doubt he will again make his deeds square with his words?

Whoever reads Gov. Wilson's speech in the expectation of finding an old-fashioned partisan attack upon his

opponents will be disappointed. Whoever reads it in the expectation of finding a patent remedy for every evil of democracy will be disappointed. Whoever reads it in the expectation of finding new schemes of government and new theories of administration will be disappointed. There is nothing of that.

It is the utterance of a statesman and student, who promises only the rule of right and justice in relation to all public questions, and who has proved his promises by his works. It is the simple confession of one man's faith in the rank and file of his fellow-men; the simple confession of one man's faith in the power of the American Nation to work out its destiny under its Constitution; the simple confession of one man's faith in a government of the people, by the people and for the people, and the application of that faith to all the problems of the hour.

But after reading that confession every honest man, from the humblest to the most fortunate, can say in Woodrow Wilson's concluding words, "I thank God and will take courage."

## A NEW DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

[March 4, 1913]

WOODROW WILSON's inauguration as President marks the beginning of a political epoch. The United States has entered upon a new phase of popular government, and no man can foresee the outcome.

This country is passing through the first radical process of political readjustment that it has known since the Civil War. Indeed, there have been only four such periods since the establishment of the Republic. One came when the Federalist principle of government was submerged by democracy under the leadership of Jeffer-

son. Another came when this democracy, under the leadership of Jackson, took physical possession of the machinery of government. The third came when the forces of freedom under the leadership of Lincoln destroyed the theory of secession and obliterated human slavery.

Until the campaign of 1912 there had been no thoroughgoing readjustment of political lines since 1860. The Liberal Republican revolt against Grant in 1872 proved abortive. The Mugwump defection of Cleveland in 1884 was temporary. The Populist uprising against the Republican party, which began in 1892 and reached its culmination in 1896, was offset by the defection of the Gold Democrats in 1896. But in none of these instances was there a general political rearrangement. Most of the Populists and Silver Republicans found their way back into the Republican party, and most of the Democrats found their way back into the Democratic party. The main lines of party division were in no sense broken.

It was quite a different matter in 1800, in 1828, in 1860 and in 1912. Under Jefferson, under Jackson, under Lincoln, this country experienced a new birth of democracy. But who can say whether 1912 means a new birth of democracy or a new birth of despotism? Who can say whether four years hence the country will stand by the principles upon which the Republic was founded, or whether it will take the first headlong plunge toward Socialism and autocracy?

Upon Woodrow Wilson rests a larger measure of political responsibility than has rested upon any other President since Lincoln. If his Administration fails, the Democratic party will go the way of the Republican party. What assurance can we have that the country will stop, or can be stopped, at the half-way house of Roosevelt's semi-Socialism? Unless all the lessons of history are misleading, the very impetus of reaction must carry it on to Debs's complete Socialism. It is possible that

the principles of a Republic can be brought into harmony with the principles of Socialism, but such a Republic would not be and could not be the Republic that we now live under. It could not be the Republic that is Opportunity.

The situation is the more precarious because the Democratic party comes into power a minority party. It has received no vote of confidence from the people as a whole. It is in possession of the Government on sufferance.

Although 6,293,120 votes were cast for the Democratic Presidential ticket in November, 8,741,680 votes were cast against it. The popular majority against the Democratic party was 2,448,560, and this majority can be won over only by Democratic leadership that will gain and hold the confidence and respect of the rank and file of the voters of the country.

It is no holiday task to which Woodrow Wilson today sets his hand.

It is Mr. Wilson's misfortune that he must improvise an Administration. In the Senate the Democratic majority is small and precarious, and many of its members have no real sympathy with the principles and policies on which their party has come into power. In the House of Representatives, largely through the efforts of Underwood and Palmer, the Democratic majority in the Sixty-second Congress was whipped into a working legislative machine. But an army of new members will invade the Sixty-third Congress. Many of them are without experience. Some of them are political accidents. It is no easy matter to teach them their parliamentary trade.

In selecting a Cabinet Mr. Wilson faced a more difficult task than confronted any of his immediate predecessors. The best Cabinet is that which is framed by a consensus of public opinion, but Mr. Wilson was deprived of such assistance. Except for Mr. Bryan, who becomes Secretary of State by the decree of political tradition, the

new Cabinet is necessarily experimental. Even Mr. Bryan has had no administrative training. The only responsible public office he ever held was that of Representative in Congress from a Nebraska district. Mr. McReynolds, who is to be Attorney-General, and Mr. Lane, who is to be Secretary of the Interior, are the only two men who have had actual experience in the administration of the affairs of a National Government.

Of the Cabinet as a whole it might be said that only Mr. Bryan and Mr. Lane had national reputations not dependent upon the offices to which they have been appointed. This Cabinet, therefore, has to be taken largely on trust, and its harmony and success will hinge upon Mr. Wilson's judgment in the selection of men of whom the country has only casual if any acquaintance.

This is important or unimportant according to circumstances. No Cabinet ever wrecked the Administration of a truly great President. No Cabinet ever saved the Administration of a mediocre President. The genius of a Daniel Webster could not make a Tyler anything but a Tyler. The corruption of a Cameron and the intrigues of a Chase could not shake public confidence in the leadership of Abraham Lincoln.

But of vastly greater moment than any individual in the Cabinet, or all of them combined, is the method by which the Cabinet was obviously organized. Here is the first concrete example of Mr. Wilson's attitude toward the Presidency—his first official interpretation of his office and duties.

Whether strong or weak in its various elements, this is no Cabinet of political trade and barter. It was fashioned by no political boss. It was fashioned for no political boss. It was fashioned to placate neither sordid political interests nor sordid financial interests. Every member stands on his own merits, as Woodrow Wilson sees these merits. His only concessions are concessions

to locality and geography. It is no Cabinet of corporation lawyers. It is no Cabinet of hack politicians or machine henchmen. It is a Cabinet of public servants, and appointed because the President who selects them believes that they are qualified for their work.

A President capable of performing his task in this spirit may sometimes go astray in his judgment of man, but he has given to the country a convincing proof of his political sincerity.

The dynamic fact of the Wilson Administration is that the American people have at the head of their Government a man who is as honest intellectually as all Presidents have been honest morally. This man is not only honest intellectually, but he has a trained mind that is accustomed to dealing with complicated questions. He knows how to think and he knows how to translate his thought into action. He knows how to explain himself and to interpret himself.

Back of it all he is a democrat—not a partisan Democrat, but a democrat with ideas and ideals. He is a democrat who believes in popular institutions. He is a democrat who has faith in the capacity of the people for self-government. He is a democrat who is in sympathy with the aims and aspirations of the great body of his fellow-countrymen who ask no favor of any government, but are determined that it shall not be used by private interests as an instrument of oppression.

"It is not the duty of the Government to support the people, but the duty of the people to support their Government," said Grover Cleveland. Here is an instance in which it is pre-eminently the duty of the American people to support the Administration that is in control of their Government, as long as that Administration can show itself worthy of confidence. We do not mean Democrats alone. Least of all do we mean Democratic politicians alone. We mean the great rank and file of the

American people, regardless of party, who alone pay the penalty for evil government, and whose children and whose children's children may pay the penalty for generations to come if the Wilson Administration is shipwrecked.

Mr. Wilson will make mistakes. His Administration may fail to accomplish all that is expected of it, as most Administrations have failed, for this is a government by men and not by gods. But if the American people give to Mr. Wilson the support that he has earned, we do not believe that he will fail in the greater achievements to which he is pledged.

If he should fail, they to that extent will have failed with him. They will have proved that their institutions have broken down. They will have proved that they are no longer competent to work the machinery of government under which a weak and almost defenseless confederation of colonies has grown into the greatest of nations. They will have proved the decadence of their own political capacities.

The failure may be Woodrow Wilson's failure, but the disaster will be the disaster of American democracy.

## A NEW AMERICAN DOCTRINE

[December 3, 1913]

EXACTLY ninety years to a day after James Monroe in a message to Congress defined the Monroe doctrine, Woodrow Wilson in an address to Congress defined the Wilson Doctrine.

The former was designed to protect the Latin-American Republics from European colonization. The latter is designed to save these Republics from recurrent anarchy. The rule of conduct laid down by the President

for the future guidance of all Latin-American countries within the sphere of the Monroe Doctrine is embodied in these words:

There can be no certain prospect of peace in America until Gen. Huerta has surrendered his usurped authority in Mexico; until it is understood on all hands, indeed, that such pretended governments will not be countenanced or dealt with by the Government of the United States. We are the friends of constitutional government in America. We are more than its friends; we are its champions; because in no other way can our neighbors, to whom we wish in every way to make proof of our friendship, work out their own development in peace and liberty.

As the Monroe Doctrine was aimed at the Holy Alliance, so the Wilson Doctrine is aimed at the professional revolutionists, the corrupting concessionaires and the corrupt dictators of all Latin America. If language means anything, it means that so far as this Administration is concerned the United States will not recognize the constitutional authority of Latin-American governments established by usurpation without the free consent of the unintimidated inhabitants thereof.

It is a bold doctrine and a radical doctrine. Whether it ever gains the force and universal acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine must depend upon the attitude of subsequent Administrations. Nevertheless, the President has pointed the way to ultimate stability in Latin-American affairs, and his doctrine is a natural corollary of the Monroe Doctrine. Obligations cannot remain forever juggled. If the United States is to guarantee the integrity of Latin-American countries, they must in turn maintain a kind of government that will not forever threaten peaceful relations between the United States and the rest of the civilized world. If we are to protect their territory, it is right that we should demand that they protect their own institutions.



Aside from the President's references to the situation in Mexico, the most sensational recommendation in his address relates to the nomination of candidates for President. Mr. Wilson urges a Presidential primary law which will abolish the national nominating convention and bring about the selection of candidates for President by a direct vote. He expresses the hope that this question "can be handled promptly and without serious controversy." He could hardly have suggested a subject less likely to be handled promptly or more certain to result in serious controversy.

It is no easy matter, even if everybody were agreed, to enact by fiat of Congress a substitute for the national nominating convention. The convention is its own ancestor. Nobody created it. It is a slow and gradual evolution, and became an institution by common consent. It knows no law except its own laws. It knows no rules except its own rules. Yet on the whole it has proved one of the most extraordinary products of American political genius.

The tide is now running as strongly against the convention as it ran against the Congressional caucus which was its predecessor. The national convention is probably doomed; yet all that is best in it can easily be saved if the States themselves will enact preferential-primary laws to control the delegates to national conventions. Such a method of nomination would be more elastic than a Presidential primary, and it would maintain those admirable elements of compromise which gave to the United States two such Presidents as Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson.

In most conservative language Mr. Wilson has delivered a radical address to Congress, with the promise of further radical recommendations yet to come. But all of it is the radicalism of a highly-matured and well-ordered mind, with clear purposes and firm basic principles.

The President's words will be searched in vain for a hint of partisanship or of party coercion. He spoke not to the Democratic majority in Congress but to all the members of Congress of all parties. It was not the address of the leader of the Democratic party but of the President of the United States, appealing to a Congress from which he asks no political favors or personal exaltation, but only honest, single-minded co-operation in the public welfare.

## A YEAR OF WILSON

[March 1, 1914]

WEDNESDAY, March 4th, Woodrow Wilson will have been President of the United States one year.

It has been a year of achievement for which there are few, if any, parallels in American history. To former President Taft, writing in the *Saturday Evening Post*, "it is a real satisfaction to one who knows the atmosphere of Washington to note the success of a strong character in dealing with the situation and improving the opportunity it offers." And Mr. Taft, with a generosity which a defeated President has rarely exhibited toward his successor, adds this further tribute of praise:

I rejoice in the existence of a situation in which the party in power is fulfilling its promises made in the platform, and is doing so by following the guidance of the head of the party, who is charged by the people with the party's responsibility.

There will be differences of opinion as to the greatest achievement thus far of the Wilson Administration. Some will find it in the downward revision of the tariff to meet the pledges of the Democratic party and in the

destruction of the lobby that for a generation dictated the essential schedules in every tariff act. Some will find it in the income tax, which is the first successful attempt since the Civil War to shift part of the burden of government from poverty to wealth. Some will find it in the banking and currency law, which is the most important financial measure enacted since the original national banking act was passed as a war measure. Some will find it in the final submission of Big Business to public opinion as represented by the Administration, and some will find it in the separation of the National Government from Wall Street, which is the most conspicuous result thus far of the President's policies.

These achievements are all of the highest importance; but they are all subordinate parts of a still greater accomplishment—the restoration of responsible, representative government. This is the supreme thing that has taken place under Mr. Wilson's leadership. Everything else is an effect following from this cause.

Without responsible, representative party government republican institutions cannot long endure, and the decline of such government was the greatest menace that had threatened the country since Secession. The policies and pledges of a party may be wise or unwise. They may be sound or weak; but unless that party when it is intrusted with the power and responsibility of government is prepared to redeem those promises in good faith and carry out its professed principles only political anarchy can follow. We do not mean that a political platform is sacred in all its planks, or that it is to be followed to the letter regardless of common sense, or common honesty, or the common welfare. But we do mean that when a party in power pledges itself to a general line of policy it must adhere to that general line of policy, or representative government becomes a fraud and a lie. There can be no "government of the people, by the people, for

the people" on any other terms. And when the people have finally lost all confidence in the integrity of representative government we have reached the beginning of the end.

It has been the high privilege of Mr. Wilson to re-establish responsible, representative government on the fundamental principles of the party. That is the great fruit of his leadership. He has done it not by the bribery of patronage; not by denunciation and intrigue and chicanery; not by selling out one promise in order to buy the fulfillment of another promise, but by sheer intellectual and moral domination, the only kind of leadership that does not lead to disaster. The influence that he exercises over Congress and his party is not the influence of a Chief Executive clothed with far-reaching legal powers, but it is the influence of a trained and disciplined mind backed by sincerity and honesty of purpose. That is the noblest form of leadership that a democracy can produce.

In his inaugural address Mr. Wilson said: "This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication." Even the strongest opponent of his policies cannot impeach that pledge. The President has kept the faith. Under his leadership his party has kept the faith. That is the supreme vindication of American institutions. Everything else depends upon the fitness of the people themselves for self-government and for the responsibilities of self-government.

## WILSON AND ROOSEVELT

[April 2, 1916]

EITHER Republicans are crooked in their opposition to President Wilson's foreign policies, or they are crooked in their opposition to the nomination of Col. Roosevelt.

If they oppose Wilson on principle, there can be no principle back of their opposition to Roosevelt. If they oppose Roosevelt on principle, there is no principle back of their opposition to Wilson. The more they profess to be for Hughes the more glaring is their insincerity in assailing Wilson.

Justice Hughes is essentially the Wilson type. His outlook on public life is essentially the Wilson outlook. His theory of public duty is essentially the Wilson theory. So far as we know there is no important difference between these two men on any important issue confronting the country. There is probably no vital question about which they are not in substantial agreement. Justice Hughes is more Republican than President Wilson: President Wilson is more Democratic than Justice Hughes. The Judge is a little more conservative than the President. The President is a little more tactful and conciliatory than the Judge in dealing with those who are not in accord with him.

What, then, is the purpose of nominating Justice Hughes? To continue the Wilson Administration under Republican auspices? To replace a Democratic Wilson with a Republican Wilson?

Now with Roosevelt there is an issue. No two men could be more unlike than Wilson and Roosevelt, except Hughes and Roosevelt.

Roosevelt is a born demagogue, however much contempt he may have for rival demagogues like Bryan and Hearst. Wilson despises all the arts of demagoguery, but demagoguery is vital to the kind of a campaign the Republicans are trying to wage against Wilson. Roosevelt has a gift for intrigue which has not been equalled in American politics since Aaron Burr. Wilson is incapable of intrigue. Roosevelt is a jingo and imperialist, a militarist with the ambition of a dictator. Wilson is against jingoism, against imperialism, against militarism, and an un-

swerving champion of democracy. Roosevelt is for war for war's sake. He believes in it as one of the virile virtues as earnestly as Bernhardt or Tirpitz believes in it. Wilson is for peace as long as peace can be maintained with honor. War to him is the last of all last resorts.

Roosevelt's attitude toward government is consistently Prussian. The man whom he most closely resembles is the Kaiser. Wilson's attitude toward government is incorrigibly American. His spirit is the spirit of Franklin, Jefferson and Lincoln.

So far as Roosevelt is capable of sincerity, he is sincere in his hatred of Wilson and in his vehement antagonism to everything that Wilson represents in public life. Roosevelt would hate anybody who was President, but in some circumstances that would be merely the hatred of envy. In Wilson's case his hatred is elemental.

The two men embody to an astounding extent the two conflicting ideals of civilization that are engaged in a 'death grapple on the battle-fields of Europe. Roosevelt is the American equivalent of Germany. His political philosophy is all German. His highest conception of government is one in which the state is supreme and in which the individual exists for the state, to be remolded and reshaped from the image of God into whatever image an all-wise and all-powerful state 'decrees best. The state is the ultimate good, the *summum bonum*. Its advancement is the imperative obligation. Whatever stands in the way is evil. The first duty of man is to be a soldier. The first duty of woman is to breed children for the service of the state.

In peace Roosevelt would meddle with the 'daily life of the citizen as Germany meddles with it. War he would carry on as Germany carries on war. There is nothing that the German Government has 'done which he would be incapable of ordering in similar circumstances.

His resentment against Germany is only the resentment that a man without a sense of humor feels at his own caricature.

To Wilson the German theory of the state is a denial of democracy. He objects to it for himself as well as for others. He has none of Bernhardi or Treitschke in him—no Nietzschean nightmares about the Superman—no morbid dreams of Weltmacht oder Niedergang. He cares much about justice and humanity; little about domination. To him the spiritual freedom of democracy and the moral responsibility of every individual for his own life are of infinitely more value than the Prussian efficiency in the world, whether military or industrial.

The moral and political differences in the two men are strikingly illustrated in their attitude toward treaty pledges. In dealing with Colombia Roosevelt adopted the course that Germany subsequently followed in dealing with Belgium. Trampling the solemn treaty obligations of the United States under foot, he "took" what he wanted in the name of necessity, knowing that it would work to his immediate political advantage.

Wilson, on the other hand, risked a crushing political defeat in order to force the repeal of the free tolls provision of the Panama Canal Act for no purpose except to keep the pledged word and the good faith of the United States unsullied.

These radically different courses of conduct toward treaty obligations were not accidental. Each man in his actions reflected his own soul, his own conscience and his own conception of government.

It seems inevitable that Wilson and Roosevelt must be the opposing candidates in the campaign. Every foreign or domestic policy of the United States, actual or potential, is somehow embodied in these two men—Germany, Mexico, preparedness, trusts, corporations, everything. They would bring to the arbitrament of the bal-

lot box the vital principles that in Europe have been submitted to the Court of Blood and Iron. The election would definitely decide the destiny of the Republic for the next generation—peace, democracy and liberty, or war, imperialism and Prussianism.

*The World* believes in the old democracy, in the old faith of the fathers, in the old principles of government upon which the Republic was established. But it makes no claims to infallibility. The old democracy commands less veneration today than it ever before commanded. The old faith of the fathers is publicly flouted. The old principles of government are boldly and aggressively challenged. Perhaps the American people are ready for a fundamental change that will leave the form of government intact but revolutionize its spirit. Perhaps the Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation represent theories that are dead and that it is time to bury their carcasses. Perhaps the true pathway to freedom lies through German Kultur, and the Germans have failed to impose it upon mankind only because they were clumsy bunglers.

In any event, *The World* is firmly convinced that the principles and policies represented by Woodrow Wilson and the principles and policies represented by Theodore Roosevelt ought to be submitted to a referendum of the American people. There alone is an issue. There alone is a question worthy of the judgment of a great people sitting as a court of last resort.

Woodrow Wilson will inevitably be the Democratic candidate. *The World* repeats that if the Republican party is honest in its antagonism to the President, Theodore Roosevelt must be the Republican candidate for President. There can be no other.



## WOODROW WILSON

[March 4, 1917]

WOODROW WILSON today completes his first term as President of the United States.

No other four years except those of Lincoln have been so eventful, and no other four years except those of Lincoln have made so much history of first importance.

One may like Mr. Wilson or dislike him, approve his policies or detest them, but nobody can deny him a place among the masterful Presidents who have stamped their genius for all time upon the Government of the United States. The courses of American history have been changed mightily by the fact that Woodrow Wilson was President, and because he has been President the processes of American Government will never again be quite what they were in the past.

Whatever the verdict of history may be upon the various policies of the Wilson Administration, no difficulty will be experienced in fixing the responsibility. Since March 4, 1913, Mr. Wilson has been the Government of the United States in as great a degree as Jefferson or Jackson and in even a greater degree than Washington or Lincoln.

Mr. Taft was never President during his four years in the White House; the Republican party was President. Mr. Roosevelt was President part of the time during his two terms; the Republican Old Guard was President part of the time, and there were glorious intervals in which Wall Street reigned supreme, after the manner of Frederick the Great, who did what he pleased and allowed his subjects to say what they pleased—Mr. Roosevelt playing the rôle of the garrulous but obedient populace.

The President of the United States during the last

four years has been Woodrow Wilson, and no other—not the Democratic party, not Wall Street, not the Cabinet, not Congress, but Woodrow Wilson and he alone. What is good is his, and what is bad is his. Never for a moment has he relaxed his grip upon the Government. Never for a moment has any other mind and purpose than his controlled the policies of his Administration. He has yielded to nobody. He has compromised with nobody except the American people. Abused and vilified as few Presidents have ever been, denounced by his enemies alternately as a weakling and a despot, a coward and a dictator, he has gone his way if not serenely at least with a sure and certain step.

His critics are fond of pretending that they cannot understand what he is trying to do, but no doubts assail him. He knows what he wants to do and how he wants to do it. When he cannot reach his goal by one path he abruptly changes his course and follows another path, but always with an eye single to the goal itself.

No other President ever so completely controlled Congress or made so little ostensible effort to control Congress. He has shaped legislation by none of the old and familiar devices. Nobody has been bribed by patronage to support his policies and measures, nor has anybody been punished by the withholding of patronage for opposing the Administration. There has been no denunciation of Congress or of individual members of Congress. Yet on every important issue, no matter how violent the opposition, the President has managed to have his way. He has ruled by the sheer force of ability—because his is the biggest brain and his the broadest vision in Washington. His victories over a sullen and reluctant Congress have been veritable triumphs of mind over matter.

Even his bitterest enemies are compelled to acknowledge this extraordinary intellectual power. When Mr. Roosevelt indulged in his outbursts of foam and fury at

the general reluctance of the American people to plunge blindly into war he could give no reason for this state of public opinion except that President Wilson had "chloroformed the conscience of the country." In other words, 100,000,000 people had been so hypnotized by the President that they thought only what he wanted them to think, believed only what he wanted them to believe and did only what he wanted them to do. A superman, indeed, if this be true—a superman above all other supermen in history; yet it is not true. Mr. Wilson's influence over public opinion lies in the ability to understand it, and give it adequate expression, not in the ability to dictate a nation's sentiments.

The chief complaint of Mr. Wilson's critics is that he is not belligerent, that he is not warlike, that he is "too proud to fight." For the welfare of American institutions this is a happy failing. A President with Mr. Wilson's genius for government and his power to impose his political will upon others would be a grave menace to the Republic if these extraordinary gifts were supplemented by military ambition and a passion for military glory.

If the world, after this War, is to be re-established upon the basis of democracy, the political principles of Woodrow Wilson must prevail. Nothing else can save it. On the verge of the crisis, when it is inevitable that the United States must draw the sword in defense of its rights and its honor, the American people can face the future in supreme confidence that they will enter the war under a leadership that knows no ulterior purpose—a leadership that is wise and sagacious and self-restrained and that will safeguard republican institutions as the most precious possession of mankind.

No other American is so well fitted by temperament, by training, by ability and by mastery of the science and art of government to solve the problems that must confront this country during the next four years. No other

American in the end is so likely to dominate the political thought of the world and guide it along the difficult path of liberty and democracy. There is nobody else to whom the American people could so safely entrust their destiny, or whose faults as well as whose virtues so surely make for the preservation of government of the people by the people and for the people.

### MR. WILSON VETOES A LIE

[October 28, 1919]

PRESIDENT WILSON'S veto of the National Prohibition Bill is the veto of a deliberate legislative lie.

The reasons given by the President for his action are that the subject-matter of the measure deals with two distinct Prohibition questions, one the enforcement of war-time Prohibition and the other the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment; that the War-Time Prohibition Act was passed because of a war emergency; that the emergency no longer exists, and that sound policy demands the repeal of all war legislation where the purposes of the particular act have been satisfied. Furthermore, the President informs Congress that "in all matters having to do with the personal habits and customs of large numbers of our people we must be certain that the established processes of legal change are followed," which is as sound advice as any lawmaking body ever received.

The War-Time Prohibition Act, which Congress sought to enforce nearly a year after the armistice went into effect, is a calculated falsehood. It declares that it is "for the purpose of conserving the man-power of the Nation and to increase efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, food and clothing for the army

and navy." Every member of the House and Senate who voted for the National Prohibition Bill knew that he was voting to enforce a lie. The object of the act was not to conserve the man-power of the Nation and to increase efficiency in the production of arms, munitions, ships, food and clothing for the army and navy, but to bridge over by means of fraud and false pretenses the interval before the Eighteenth Amendment can take effect.

The bill was originally framed by the agents of the Anti-Saloon League lobby; it was driven through Congress by the lobby, and it is the most shamelessly mendacious piece of legislation that any Congress ever enacted.

In vetoing this lie, President Wilson has performed not only a highly courageous act but a highly moral and patriotic act. There can be no respect for government unless government is honest. There can be no respect for law when the law lies. There can be no respect for authority when authority is exercised under false pretenses. Fraud is fraud, whether it is committed by individuals or whether it is committed by Congress.

The President is powerless to wipe this war-time Prohibition fraud from the statute books, but his peremptory refusal to be a party to the repressive and tyrannical legislation enacted for its enforcement is one of the most scathing rebukes ever administered to a cowardly and faithless Congress.

### NO THIRD TERM

[December 4, 1919]

ALTHOUGH the Democratic State Convention of South Dakota by a unanimous vote has indorsed President Wilson for a third term, its action must be construed

merely as a compliment to the greatest statesman of his generation. It cannot be accepted as a serious expression of opinion in regard to the Democratic candidate for President in 1920.

*The World* does not believe that President Wilson, in any circumstances, will consider a renomination; nor could any sincere friend of the President desire that his splendid career should end in such an anti-climax; for an anti-climax it would be, even if he were renominated, even if he were re-elected.

Mr. Wilson has already wrecked his health and impoverished his vitality in the service of his country, a service which has given to the United States the highest prestige that it has ever attained, and which will remain as a monument to his statesmanship throughout the centuries, in spite of the efforts of a debased partisanship to deface and destroy it. Whatever comes out of the remaining fifteen months of his term of office, the record is made.

Great pressure will be exerted on the President to become a candidate again in 1920. Every Democratic office-seeker will be eager to capitalize Mr. Wilson's name and fame to his own advantage; but this is a matter on which the Chief Magistrate cannot afford to yield, whatever arguments may be presented to him.

From the point of view of the public welfare, the renomination of the President could not fail to be a mistake. All the new and pressing public questions growing out of the War which ought to be decided at the next election would be submerged. No matter how the campaign began, it would end as a conflict over the third term. That would be the one dominating issue, and everything else would be forgotten, to the hopeless confusion of government for the next four years.

Woodrow Wilson needs no third-term nomination. He needs no vindication. His two Administrations mark

a new era in American government and his place in history is secure. Let the record stand.

## WOODROW WILSON—AN INTERPRETATION

[March 4, 1921]

*Hundreds of years hence Wilson's name will be one of the greatest in history.*—Jan Christian Smuts, Premier of the Union of South Africa.

No other American has made so much world history as Woodrow Wilson, who retires at noon today from the office of President of the United States. No other American has ever bulked so large in the affairs of civilization or wielded so commanding an influence in shaping their ends.

The great outstanding figure of the war, Mr. Wilson remains the great outstanding figure of the peace. Broken in health and shattered in body, Mr. Wilson is leaving the White House, but his spirit still dominates the scene. It pervades every chancellery in Europe. It hovers over every capital. Because Woodrow Wilson was President of the United States during the most critical period of modern history international relations have undergone their first far-reaching moral revolution.

Mr. Harding is assuming the duties of the Presidency, but the main interest in Mr. Harding is still a reflected interest, which is concerned chiefly with the efforts that his Administration may make to adjust itself to the forces that Mr. Wilson has set in motion. Stripped of all the paraphernalia of his office, Mr. Wilson, by virtue of his achievements, remains the most potent single influence in the modern world; yet after his eight years in the White House it may be doubted if even the American people

themselves know him better or understand him better than they did the day he was first inaugurated.

Neither Mr. Wilson's friends nor his enemies have ever succeeded in interpreting him or in explaining him, nor can any interpretation or explanation be satisfactory which fails at the outset to recognize in him the simplest and at the same time the most complex character in the greatest drama ever played on the stage of human history. Even his closest associates have never found it easy to reconcile a fervent political democracy with an unbending intellectual aristocracy, or to determine which of those characteristics was dominant in his day-to-day decisions.

No man ever sat in the President's chair who was more genuinely a democrat or held more tenaciously to his faith in democracy than Woodrow Wilson, but no other man ever sat in the President's chair who was so contemptuous of all intellect that was inferior to his own or so impatient with its laggard processes.

Mr. Wilson was a President who dealt almost exclusively in ideas. He cared little or nothing about political organization and rarely consulted the managing politicians of his party. When they conferred with him it was usually at their request and not at his request. Patronage hardly entered into his calculations as an agency of government. He disliked to be troubled about appointments, and when he had filled an office he was likely to be indifferent as to the manner in which that office was subsequently administered, unless his own measures were antagonized or his policies obstructed.

No man was ever more impersonal in his attitude toward government, and that very impersonality was the characteristic which most baffled the American people. Mr. Wilson had a genius for the advocacy of great principles, but he had no talent whatever for advocating himself, and to a country that is accustomed to think in headlines about political questions his subtlety of mind and his



careful, precise style of expression were quite as likely to be an obstacle to the communication of thought as a medium for the communication of thought. That is how such phrases as "too proud to fight" and "peace without victory" were successfully wrested from their context by his critics and twisted into a fantastic distortion of their true meaning.

Mr. Wilson was likewise totally deficient in the art of advertising, and advertising is the very breath of American politics. He held himself aloof from all these points of public contact. *The World's* relations with him have certainly been as close and intimate as those of any other newspaper; yet during the eight years in which Mr. Wilson has been in the White House he never sought a favor from *The World*, he never asked for support either for himself or any of his policies, he never complained when he was criticised, he never offered to explain himself or his attitude on any issue of government. In the troublesome days of his Administration he often expressed his gratitude for services that *The World* had rendered in the interpretation of his policies, but he never solicited such interpretation or took measures to facilitate it. He was an eloquent pleader for the principles in which he believed, but he had no faculty whatever for projecting himself into the picture.

Mr. Wilson's enemies are fond of calling him a theorist, but there is little of the theorist about him, otherwise he could never have made more constructive history than any other man of his generation. What are commonly called theories in his case were the practical application of the experience of history to the immediate problems of government, and in the experience of history Mr. Wilson is an expert. With the exception of James Madison, who was called "the Father of the Constitution," Mr. Wilson is the most profound student of government among all the Presidents, and he had what Madison con-

spicuously lacked, which was the faculty to translate his knowledge of government into the administration of government.

When Mr. Wilson was elected President he had reached the conclusion which most unprejudiced students of American government eventually arrive at—that the system of checks and balances is unworkable in practice and that the legislative and executive branches cannot be in fact co-ordinate, independent departments. Other Presidents have acted on that hypothesis without daring to admit it, and endeavored to control Congress by patronage and by threats. Mr. Wilson without any formality established himself as the leader of his party in Congress, Premier as well as President, and the originator of the party's programme of legislation.

Senators and Representatives denounced him as an autocrat and a dictator. Congress was described as the President's rubber stamp, but Mr. Wilson established something that more nearly resembled responsible government than anything that had gone before, and Congress under his direct leadership made a record for constructive legislation for which there is no parallel. It was due to this kind of leadership that such measures as the Federal Reserve Banking Law were enacted, which later proved to be the one bulwark between the American people and a financial panic of tragic proportions.

But Mr. Wilson's domestic policies in spite of their magnitude have been obscured by his foreign policies. Had there been no war, these policies in themselves would have given to the Wilson Administration a place in American history higher than that of any other since the Civil War. What some of his predecessors talked about doing he did, and he accomplished it by the process of making himself the responsible leader of his party in Congress—a process that is simple enough in itself but

capable of fulfilment only in the hands of a man with an extraordinary capacity for imposing his will on his associates. Mr. Wilson's control over Congress for six years was once described as the most impressive triumph of mind over matter known to American politics.

When we begin the consideration of Mr. Wilson's foreign policies we are entering one of the most remarkable chapters in all history, and one which will require the perspective of history for a true judgment.

The first step in the development of these foreign policies came in Mr. Wilson's refusal to recognize Huerta, who had participated in the plot to murder President Madero and made himself the dictator of Mexico by reason of this assassination. The crime was committed during Mr. Taft's Administration. When Mr. Wilson came into office he served notice that there would be no recognition of Huerta and no recognition of any Mexican Government which was not established by due process of law.

What was plainly in Mr. Wilson's mind was a determination to end political assassination in Latin America as a profitable industry, and compel recognition, to some extent at least, of democratic principles and constitutional forms. On this issue he had to face the intense opposition of all the financial interests in the United States which had Mexican holdings, and a consolidated European opposition as well. Every dollar of foreign money invested in Mexico was confident that what Mexico needed most was such a dictatorship as that of Huerta or American intervention. Mr. Wilson's problem was to get rid of Huerta without involving the United States in war, and then by steady pressure bring about the establishment of a responsible government that rested on something at least resembling the consent of the governed. Only a statesman of high ideals would ever have attempted it, and only a statesman of almost infinite pa-

tience would have been able to adhere to the task that Mr. Wilson set for himself.

Mexico is not yet a closed incident, but Mr. Wilson's policy has been vindicated in principle. For the first time since Mr. Roosevelt shocked the moral sense and aroused the political resentment of all the Latin-American states by the rape of Panama faith in the integrity and friendship of the United States has been restored among the other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Of equal or even greater ethical importance was Mr. Wilson's insistence on the repeal of the Panama Canal Tolls Act, which discriminated in favor of American ships in spite of the plain provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. This was the more creditable on Mr. Wilson's part because he himself had been tricked during the campaign into giving his support to this measure. When he began to perceive the diplomatic consequences of this treaty violation Mr. Wilson reversed himself and demanded that Congress reverse itself. Had he done otherwise, the American people would have had scant opportunity to protest against the German perfidy which turned a treaty into "a scrap of paper."

When Germany, at the beginning of August, 1914, declared war successively on Russia, France and Belgium, thereby bringing Great Britain into the most stupendous conflict of all the centuries, Mr. Wilson did what every President has done when other nations have gone to war. He issued a proclamation of neutrality. He then went further, however, than any of his predecessors had done and urged the American people to be not only neutral in deed but "impartial in thought." Mr. Wilson has been severely criticised for this appeal. The more violent pro-Germans and the more violent pro-French and pro-British regarded it as a personal insult and an attempt on the part of the President to stifle what they were pleased to regard as their conscience.

Mr. Wilson asked the American people to be impartial in thought because he knew as a historian the danger that threatened if the country were to be divided into two hostile camps, the one blindly and unreasoningly applauding every act of the Germans and the other blindly and unreasoningly applauding every act of the Allies. In the early years of its life the Republic was all but wrecked by the emotional and political excesses of the pro-French Americans and the pro-British Americans in the war that followed the French Revolution. The warning against a passionate attachment to the interests of other nations which is embodied in Washington's Farewell Address was the first President's solemn admonition against the evils of a divided allegiance. Mr. Wilson had no desire to see the country drift into a similar situation in which American rights, American interests and American prestige would all be sacrificed to gratify the American adherents of the various European belligerents. Moreover, he understood far better than his critics that issues would soon arise between the belligerents and the United States which would require on the part of the American people that impartiality of thought that is demanded of the just and upright judge. He knew that the American people might ultimately become the final arbiters of the issues of the conflict.

The United States was the only great nation outside the sphere of conflict. It was the only great nation that had no secret diplomatic understandings with either set of belligerents. It was the only great nation that was in a position to uphold the processes of international law and to use its good offices as a mediator when the opportunity arose.

For two years Mr. Wilson genuinely believed that it would be possible for the United States to fulfil this mission, and he never fully lost hope until that day in January, 1917, when the German Government wantonly

wrecked all the informal peace negotiations that were then in progress and decided to stake the fate of the empire on a single throw of the U-boat dice.

Mr. Wilson perceived quite as quickly and quite as early as anybody the possibility that the United States would be 'drawn into the war, but he perceived also what most of his critics failed to perceive, that the immediate danger of the country was not war but a divided people. While he was engaged in framing the first *Lusitania* note he discussed the situation with one of his callers at the White House in words that have since proved prophetic:

I do not know whether the German Government intends to keep faith with the United States or not. It is my personal opinion that Germany has no such intention, but I am less concerned about the ultimate intentions of Germany, than about the attitude of the American people, who are already divided into three groups: those who are strongly pro-German, those who are strongly pro-Ally, and the vast majority who expect me to find a way to keep the United States out of war. I do not want war, yet I do not know that I can keep the country out of the war. That depends on Germany, and I have no control over Germany. *But I intend to handle this situation in such a manner that every American citizen will know that the United States Government has done everything it could to prevent war. Then if war comes we shall have a united country, and with a united country there need be no fear about the result.*

Mr. Wilson's policy from that day to April 2, 1917, must be read in the light of those words. He plunged forthwith into that extraordinary debate with the German Government over the submarine issue—the most momentous debate ever held—but he was only incidentally addressing himself to the rulers of Germany. He was talking to the conscience of the civilized world, but primarily to the conscience of the United States, explaining, clarifying, elucidating the issue. His reluctance to countenance any extensive measures of preparedness was the product

of a definite resolution not to give Germany and her American supporters an opportunity to declare that the United States, while these issues were pending, was arming for war against the Imperial Government.

When Mr. Wilson began this debate he knew something which his critics did not know and which for reasons of state he did not choose to tell them. Weeks before the destruction of the *Lusitania* two-thirds of the German General Staff were in favor of war with the United States as a military measure in the interest of Germany. They were under the spell of Tirpitz. They believed that the submarine could do all that the Grand Admiral said it could do. They argued that inasmuch as the Allies were borrowing money in the United States, obtaining food from the United States and purchasing great quantities of munitions in the United States, Germany, by restricting submarine warfare in answer to American protests, was paying an excessive price for what was in effect a fictitious neutrality. In their opinion the United States as a neutral was already doing more for the Allies than it could do as an active belligerent if free scope were given to the U boats. The American Navy, they said, could be safely disregarded, because with Germany already blockaded by the British Navy, and the German Grand Fleet penned in, the addition of the American Navy, or a dozen navies for that matter, would make little difference in respect to the actual facts of sea power. On the other hand there was not enough shipping available to feed the Allies and enable the United States to send an army to Europe. If the United States tried to provide troops, the British would starve. If the United States could not send troops, Germany would be quite as well off with the United States in the war as out of the war, and would have the priceless additional advantage of being able to employ her submarines as she saw fit, regardless of the technicalities of international law.

In the fall of 1916 Mr. Wilson decided definitely that the relations between the United States and Germany were approaching a climax. If the war continued much longer the United States would inevitably be drawn in. There was no prospect of a decision. The belligerent armies were deadlocked. Unwilling to wait longer for events, Mr. Wilson made up his mind that he would demand from each side a statement of its aims and objects and compel each side to plead its own cause before the court of the public opinion of the world. This was done on Dec. 18, 1916, in a joint note which was so cold and 'dispassionate in its terms that its import was hardly understood.

The President said that the aims and objects of the war on both sides "as stated in general terms to their own people and the world" seemed to be "virtually the same," and he asked for a bill of particulars. Instantly there was wild turmoil and recrimination on the part of the Allies and their friends in the United States. The President had declared, they said, that the Germans and the Allies were fighting for the same thing. Mr. Wilson had expressed no opinion of his own one way or the other and the obvious discovery was soon made in London and Paris that the President had given to the Allies the opportunity which they needed of officially differentiating their war aims from those of the Germans. The German Government missed its opportunity completely, and by their own answer to the President's note the Allies succeeded in consolidating their moral positions, which was something they had never previously been able to do in spite of all their propaganda.

Informal peace negotiations were still in progress, although conducted in secret and carefully screened from the knowledge of all peoples involved in the conflict. On Jan. 22, 1917, Mr. Wilson made his last attempt at mediation in the "peace without victory" address to the Sen-



ate in which he defined what he regarded as the fundamental conditions of a permanent peace. Most of the basic principles of this address were afterward incorporated into the Fourteen Points. Here again Mr. Wilson was the victim of his own precision of language and of the settled policy of his critics of reading into his public utterances almost everything except what he actually said. He himself had insisted on giving his own interpretation of "peace without victory," and this interpretation was instantly rejected by the super-patriots who regarded themselves as the sole custodians of all the issues of the war.

When the armistice was signed one of the most eminent of living British statesmen gave it as his opinion that the war had lasted two years too long, and that the task of salvaging an enduring peace from the wreck had become well-nigh insuperable. It will always be one of the fascinating riddles of history to guess what the result would have been if Mr. Wilson's final proposals for mediation had been accepted. The United States would not have entered the war, and a less violent readjustment of the internal affairs of Europe would probably have resulted. There would have been no Bolshevik revolution in Russia and no economic collapse of Europe. Nor is it certain that most of the really enduring benefits of the Treaty of Versailles could not have been as well obtained by negotiation as they were finally obtained through a military victory which cost a price that still staggers humanity.

Be that as it may, the German Government, now fighting to maintain the dynasty and the Junker domination, took the issue out of Mr. Wilson's hands. Ten days after his "peace without victory" address the German autocracy put into effect its cherished programme of ruthless submarine warfare. The only possible answer on the part of the United States was the dismissal of Count

von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador, and from that time war between the United States and Germany was only a matter of days. But Mr. Wilson had achieved the great purpose that he had formulated two years before. He had been balked in his efforts at mediation, but he had united the American people on the issues of the conflict. He had demonstrated to them that their Government had exerted every honorable means to avoid war and that its hands were clean. There was no uncertainty in their own minds that the responsibility for the war rested solely on Germany, and Mr. Wilson now purposed to write the terms of peace with the sword.

Mr. Wilson's War Address on the night of April 2, 1917, was the most dramatic event that the National Capitol had ever known. In the presence of both branches of Congress, of the Supreme Court, of the Cabinet and of the Diplomatic Corps, Mr. Wilson summoned the American people not to a war but to a crusade in words that instantaneously captivated the imagination of the Nation:

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have already carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

This was not Woodrow Wilson, the intellectual aristocrat, who was speaking, but Woodrow Wilson the fer-

vent democrat, proclaiming a new declaration of independence to the embattled peoples.

No sooner had Congress declared war than Mr. Wilson proceeded to mobilize all the resources of the Nation and throw them into the conflict. This war was different from any other war in which the United States had ever engaged, not only by reason of its magnitude but by reason of the necessity for co-ordinating American military plans with the military plans of the Allies. The Allies were not quite agreed as to what they desired of the United States, aside from unlimited financial assistance, and the solution of the general problem depended more or less on the trend of events.

The test of any war policy is its success, and it is a waste of time to enter into a vindication of the manner in which the Wilson Administration made war, or to trouble about the accusations of waste and extravagance, as if war were an economic process which could be carried on prudently and frugally. The historian is not likely to devote serious attention to the partisan accusations relating to Mr. Wilson's conduct of the war, but he will find it interesting to record the manner in which the President brought his historical knowledge to bear in shaping the war policies of the country.

The voluntary system and the draft system had both been discredited in the Civil War, so Mr. Wilson demanded a Selective-Service Act under which the country could raise 10,000,000 troops, if 10,000,000 troops were needed, without deranging its essential industries. It had taken Mr. Lincoln three years to find a General whom he could intrust with the command of the Union armies. Mr. Wilson picked his Commander in Chief before he went to war and then gave to Gen. Pershing the same kind of ungrudging support that Mr. Lincoln gave to Gen. Grant. The Civil War had been financed by greenbacks and bond issues peddled by bankers. Mr. Wilson

called on the American people to finance their own war, and they unhesitatingly responded. In the war with Spain the commissary system had broken down completely owing to the antiquated methods that were employed. No other army in time of war was ever so well fed or so well cared for as that of the United States in the conflict with Germany.

Mistakes there were in plenty, both in methods and in the choice of men, and errors of judgment and the shortcomings that always result from a lack of experience, but the impartial verdict of history must be that when everything is set forth on the debit side of the balance sheet which can be set forth Mr. Wilson remains the most vigorous of all the war Presidents. Yet it is also true that history will concern itself far less with Mr. Wilson as a war President than with Mr. Wilson as a peace-making President. It is around him as a peace-making President that all the passions and prejudices and disappointments of the world still rage.

Mr. Wilson in his "peace without victory" address to the Senate previous to the entrance of the United States into the war had sketched a general plan of a co-operative peace. "I am proposing, as it were," he said, "that the nations with one accord should adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world." He returned to the subject again in his War Address, in which he defined the principles for which the United States was to fight and the principles on which an enduring peace could be made. The time came when it was necessary to be still more specific.

In the winter of 1918 the morale of the Allies was at its lowest ebb. Russia had passed into the hands of the Bolsheviki and was preparing to make a separate peace with Germany. There was widespread discontent in Italy, and everywhere in Europe soldiers and civilians were asking one another what they were really fighting

for. On Jan. 8 Mr. Wilson went before Congress and delivered the address which contained the Fourteen Points of peace, a message which was greeted both in the United States and in Europe as a veritable Magna Charta of the nations. Mr. Wilson had again become the spokesman of the aspirations of mankind, and from the moment that this address was delivered the thrones of the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs ceased to be stable.

Ten months later they were to crumble and collapse. Before the armistice was signed on Nov. 11, 1918, Mr. Wilson had overthrown the doctrine of Divine right in Europe. The Hapsburgs ran away. The Kaiser was compelled to abdicate and take refuge in exile, justifying his flight by the explanation that Wilson would not make peace with Germany while a Hohenzollern was on the throne. This was the climax of Mr. Wilson's power and influence and, strangely enough, it was the dawn of his own day of disaster.

For nearly six years Mr. Wilson had manipulated the Government of the United States with a skill that was almost uncanny. He had turned himself from a minority President into a majority President. He had so deftly outmanœuvred all his opponents in Congress and out of Congress that they had nothing with which to console themselves except their intensive hatred of the man and all that pertained to him. Then at the very summit of his career he made his first fatal blunder.

Every President in the off-year election urges the election of a Congress of his own party. That is part of the routine of politics, and during the campaign of 1918 Mr. Wilson's advisers urged him to follow the precedent. What they forgot and he forgot was that it was no time for partisan precedents, and he allowed his distrust of the Republican leaders in Congress to sweep him into an inexcusable error that he, of all men, should have avoided. The Sixty-fifth Congress was anything but popular. The

Western farmers were aggrieved because the price of wheat had been regulated and the price of cotton had not. The East was greatly dissatisfied with the war taxes, which it regarded as an unfair discrimination, and it remembered Mr. Kitchin's boast that the North wanted the war and the North would have to pay for it. There was general complaint from business interests against the Southern Democratic control of the legislative department, and all this sentiment instantly crystallized when the President asked for another Democratic Congress. Republicans who were loyally supporting the Administration in all its war activities were justly incensed that a party issue had been raised. A Republican Congress was elected and by inference the President sustained a personal defeat.

Misfortunes did not come singly in Mr. Wilson's case. Following the mistake of appealing for the election of a Democratic Congress he made an equally serious mistake in the selection of his Peace Commission.

To anybody who knows Mr. Wilson, who knows Mr. Lloyd George, who knows Mr. Clemenceau, nothing could be sillier than the chapters of Keynes and Dillon in which they undertake to picture the President's unfitness to cope with the European masters of diplomacy. Mr. Wilson for years had been playing with European masters of diplomacy as a cat plays with a mouse. To assume that Mr. Wilson was ever deceived by the transparent tactics of Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Clemenceau is to assume the impossible. It would be as easy to conceive of his being tricked and bamboozled by the United States Senate.

Mr. Wilson needed strong Republican representation on the Peace Commission not to reinforce him in his struggles with his adversaries at Paris but to divide with him the responsibility for a treaty of peace that was doomed in advance to be a disappointment. Although the popular sentiment of Europe was almost passionate

in its advocacy of President Wilson's peace programme, all the special interests that were seeking to capitalize the peace for their own advantage or profit were actively at work and were beginning to swing all the influence that they could command on their various Governments. It was inevitable from the outset that Mr. Wilson could never get the peace that he had expected. The Treaty was bound to be a series of compromises that would satisfy nobody, and when Mr. Wilson assumed all the responsibility for it in advance he assumed a responsibility that no statesman who had ever lived could carry alone. Had he taken Mr. Root or Mr. Taft or both of them with him the terms of the Treaty of Versailles might have been no different, but the Senate would have been robbed of the partisan grievance on which it organized the defeat of ratification.

Day after day during the conference Mr. Wilson fought the fight for a peace that represented the liberal thought of the world. Day after day the odds against him lengthened. The contest finally resolved itself into a question of whether he should take what he could get or whether he should withdraw from the conference and throw the doors open to chaos. The President made the only decision that he had a moral right to make. He took what he could get, nor are the statesmen with whom he was associated altogether to blame because he did not get more. They too had to contend against forces over which they had no control. They were not free agents either, and Mr. Smuts has summed up the case in two sentences:

It was not the statesmen that failed so much as the spirit of the peoples behind them. The hope, the aspiration, for a new world order of peace and right and justice, however deeply and universally felt, was still only feeble and ineffective in comparison with the dominant national passions which found their expression in the peace treaty.

All the passions and hatreds bred of four years of merciless warfare, all the insatiable fury for revenge, all the racial ambitions that had been twisted and perverted by centuries of devious diplomacy—these were all gathered around the council table, clamorous in their demand to dictate the terms.

Mr. Wilson surrendered more than he dreamed he was surrendering, but it is not difficult to follow his line of reasoning. The League of Nations was to be a continuing court of equity, sitting in judgment on the peace itself, revising its terms when revision became necessary and possible, slowly readjusting the provisions of the treaty to a calmer and saner state of public mind. Get peace first. Establish the League, and the League would rectify the inevitable mistakes of the treaty.

It is a curious commentary on human nature that when the Treaty was completed and the storm of wrath broke, all the rage, all the resentment, all the odium should have fallen on the one man who had struggled week in and week out against the forces of reaction and revenge and had written into the treaty all that it contains which makes for the international advancement of the race.

Into that record must also go the impressive fact that the Treaty of Versailles was rejected by the United States Senate, under the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge, not because of its acknowledged defects and shortcomings, not because it breathed the spirit of a Carthaginian peace in its punitive clauses, but because of its most enlightened provision, the covenant of the League of Nations, which is the one hope of a war-racked world.

When people speak of the tragedy of Mr. Wilson's career they have in mind only the temporary aspects of it—the universal dissatisfaction with the treaty of peace, his physical collapse, his defeat in the Senate and the verdict at the polls in November. They forget that the end of the chapter is not yet written. The League of



Nations is a fact, whatever the attitude of the United States may be toward it, and it will live unless the peoples of the earth prove their political incapacity to use it for the promotion of their own welfare. The principle of self-determination will remain as long as men believe in the right of self-government and are willing to die for it. It was Woodrow Wilson who wrote that principle into the law of nations, even though he failed to obtain a universal application of it. Tacitus said of the Catti tribesmen, "Others go to battle; these go to war," and Mr. Wilson went to war in behalf of the democratic theory of government extended to all the affairs of the nations. That war is not yet won, and the Commander in Chief is crippled by the wounds that he received on the field of action. But the responsibility for the future does not rest with him. It rests with the self-governing peoples for whom he has blazed the trail. All the complicated issues of this titanic struggle finally reduce themselves to these prophetic words of Maximilian Harden: "Only one conqueror's work will endure—Wilson's thought."

Woodrow Wilson on this morning of the fourth of March can say in the words of Paul the Apostle to Timothy:

*"For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand.*

*"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."*

## CHAPTER IX

### ALFRED E. SMITH

MR. COBB was greatly interested in the development of Alfred E. Smith as a public man of the first rank and in his rise to prominence as a leader in progressive legislation and an expert in the business of the State—a chapter to which “Finis” should not soon be written.

#### SAVED FROM ETERNAL DISGRACE

[July 25, 1918]

NOT only has the Democratic party of New York been saved from disgrace and degradation, but out of the Saratoga Convention have come a ticket that Democrats can support and a platform that Democrats can ratify.

The credit for the complete victory over disloyalty and demagoguery that was won at Saratoga belongs to those up-State Democrats who uncompromisingly refused to accept William R. Hearst as the party candidate. In particular it belongs to William Church Osborn, who had the moral courage to make Hearst the issue in the primaries as well as in the convention and boldly met the challenge of the Hearst candidacy.

When Tammany entered into partnership with Hearst last fall to make Hylan Mayor of New York City, it invited the situation that all but disrupted the Democratic party of this State. It was inevitable that Hearst, having

selected the Tammany candidate for Mayor, would next insist upon his right to select the regular Democratic candidate for Governor and would use his influence over Hylan to club Tammany into line.

This is what happened, and naturally enough, in the selection of a candidate for Governor, Hearst turned to himself. What he had to offer Tammany in exchange for the nomination was the disloyal vote of New York and the vote of the un-American Bolshevik elements whose notion of free government is the despoiling of all property-owners for the benefit of those who have not yet acquired property.

That this vote is considerable, that it might easily hold the balance of power in a closely contested election, was shown in New York City last fall, and Hearst is peculiarly its leader and spokesman. For more than a dozen years he has been the persistent champion of Bolshevik doctrine, and from the beginning of the war he was an essential part of the German propaganda, so much so that the Kaiser unhesitatingly praised the work of the Hearst newspapers in behalf of the German cause.

Unquestionably, Tammany would have taken Hearst as a candidate for Governor if it had not been for the certainty of a party split which developed at the Saratoga Convention. It might have taken him reluctantly, as it did in 1906, but it would have taken him if the up-State Democrats had not stood firmly for party honor and party patriotism.

It was they who brought about the designation of Alfred E. Smith for Governor. It was within the Tammany and Brooklyn organizations that the chief opposition to Mr. Smith's nomination centred, in spite of the fact that he is a Tammany leader and a Tammany officeholder. As Tammany rejected Mr. Smith for Mayor last fall regardless of his extraordinary ability and his great popularity, so it would have rejected him for Governor if

the up-State Democrats had not forced his nomination and thereby rescued their party from unspeakable shame.

The Saratoga Convention has turned out so much better than anybody had a right to expect that the whole State is to be congratulated on the result. Although it is unbelievable that a candidate with Hearst's record could be elected Governor of New York at a time when the country demands 100 per cent. loyalty from every citizen, the very fact of his nomination would have been a blot upon the war record of the Nation. Every element of disloyalty and pro-German pacifism in the United States would have taken new courage from the nomination of such a man for Governor by the Democratic Party—the party of Woodrow Wilson—in the most populous State of the Union.

From William R. Hearst to Alfred E. Smith is like emerging from a sewer into sunlight, and in that choice we believe the Democratic voters of New York have found a true expression of their principles, their loyalty and their patriotism.

## NULLIFYING THE ELECTION

[March 24, 1923]

BACK of the controversy between Gov. Smith and the Assembly lies a grave question of political principle—Is the election of 1922 to be nullified by a minority?

The issue between Mr. Smith and Mr. Machold is an issue between representative government and organized obstruction to representative government.

Mr. Smith's plurality in the election last fall was 386,000. Had he alone, among the Democratic candidates, been victorious at the polls, this plurality could have been interpreted merely as a proof of his great

personal popularity; but along with Mr. Smith the entire Democratic State ticket was elected. A Democratic United States Senator was elected and a Democratic State Senate was elected. The Assembly remained Republican only by virtue of the rotten-borough provisions of the State Constitution. If the up-State counties were subjected to the same rule of representation which is provided for New York City the Assembly would have been Democratic too, and Mr. Smith would be at the head of a responsible administration of government.

Only a clever partisan trick in the Constitutional Convention of 1894 makes it possible for the Republican Assemblymen to block the Governor's program, and in taking a partisan advantage of that trick they are denying the right of the majority in New York to control its government.

Nobody will claim that the Republican Assemblymen are under moral or political obligations to assent to everything that Gov. Smith demands, or to pass every bill that he recommends. Nobody will deny, either, that some of the legislation that has been slaughtered in the Assembly was sent there by the State Senate to be slaughtered. All this must be admitted in the interests of fairness and honesty; but at the same time it is evident that under the leadership of Mr. Machold the Assembly has set out to block the Governor in many matters for no better reason than partisan obstruction. In respect to legislation like the Executive Budget Bill there is no honest party line of cleavage whatever. There is nothing involved on which men can by any possibility divide as Democrats and Republicans. The Assembly burked it only because the Governor is a Democrat.

In accepting a conference Gov. Smith has shown himself a much better man in every respect than his opponents in the Assembly. He is working for the welfare of the State, while they are thinking only of the Republi-

can organization, which they believe will benefit in one way or another if the Governor's program can be wrecked. They could then go before the voters again with their stereotyped argument that it is futile to elect a Democratic Governor because he cannot carry the Legislature with him.

What it all amounts to is a confession that New York has a system of government under the existing Constitution in which the minority can dictate to the majority. It is equivalent to saying that under this Constitution New York cannot have a Democratic Administration, no matter what the majority may be, because the rotten-borough provisions for representation are too effective to be overcome. If this is the issue the Republican Assemblymen are trying to raise in their controversy with the Governor, Mr. Smith can well afford to accept the challenge.

## A GOVERNMENT THAT CAN'T WORK

[May 5, 1923]

THE Constitution of the State of New York prohibits representative government. It likewise prohibits responsible government. Those two sentences tell the story of the Legislature.

The Government of New York as established by the Constitution works only now and then. It never functions as a unit. Even the Executive Department is not under the control of the Governor, but only so much of it as relates to the duties that devolve on him personally.

The preamble to the Constitution runs as follows:

We, the People of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our Freedom, in order to secure its blessings do establish this Constitution.

The number of blessings that this Constitution secures to the people of New York is highly problematical. Under it the Government of the State was intended to be Republican so far as the Legislature was concerned, regardless of the popular vote. This was brought about by a most ingenious rotten-borough system under which tens of thousands of votes in the country districts could be made to balance hundreds of thousands of votes in the cities.

Gov. Smith had a plurality last fall of more than 385,000, and the rest of the Democratic State ticket had a generous but varying margin. In most of the States this majority would have carried with it a Legislature overwhelmingly Democratic in both its branches. What actually happened was that the Senate was Democratic by only one vote and the Assembly remained Republican.

The average citizen when he went to the polls last fall thought he knew what he was voting for, but as a matter of fact he did not vote for anything tangible or anything that could be readily translated into legislation. He lives under a Government in which it is comparatively simple to vote against some particular individual but not under a Government which can carry out a constructive policy.

The thing that is inevitable under the Constitution of this State has again happened at Albany. With a Democratic Senate and a Republican Assembly the Legislature was deadlocked. Issues which had no distinctive partisan basis were made partisan in anticipation of next fall's election, the Democrats appealing to the city vote and the Republicans appealing to the country vote. On questions in which the November majorities presumably meant something the vote ended largely in futility.

Except for the necessity of passing the appropriation bills for the support of the various State institutions, the Legislature might practically as well not have met. The

public would have sustained no serious loss. Nothing of permanent importance would have been sacrificed. The results of the election would have been no more completely nullified than they have been in a politically divided Legislature selected by an intricately contrived rotten-borough method.

The majority in New York is a shackled majority unless it happens to be Republican, and then it is half-shackled. Government in New York does not govern except approximately by unanimous consent. The freedom to which the Constitution refers is the freedom to maintain a clumsy and cumbersome political machine that produces a minimum of results after a maximum of effort.

It is hardly worth while to abuse the Legislature for the pitiful record that it has made during the last four months. The legislature is what it was intended to be. It does not represent the people of New York in any sense in which the term can be applied to a responsible Government. It cannot represent them. It was not established to represent them, and it is useless to quarrel with the product of a system while retaining the system itself.



## CHAPTER X

### THE PROFESSION OF JOURNALISM

MR. COBB was much more concerned with practising than with discussing the profession of journalism. Few articles from his pen in the entire period of his editorship were devoted to this subject. That entitled "Mr. Pulitzer's Journalism" appeared two days after the great editor's death.

#### ARE NEWSPAPERS DECLINING IN INFLUENCE?

[Dec. 30, 1909]

ONE of the leading magazines of the country—*The Atlantic Monthly*—is advertising a series of articles entitled "The Decline of Public Confidence in the Newspaper Press."

That the public has lost confidence in some newspapers and in some kinds of newspapers may be accepted as a matter of course, like the loss of public confidence in certain politicians and statesmen and theories of government. But if there is a marked decline of public confidence in newspapers as a whole, that fact is of such far-reaching public importance that it deserves the closest study and investigation.

More newspapers are printed than ever before. More newspapers are read than ever before. If the public has lost confidence in newspapers, why does it read them in such vast numbers? Merely to amuse itself? Merely to pass away the time? Merely to acquire information

which it distrusts and upon which it can place no reliance? The American people have never impressed us as a nation of idiots and lunatics. They must have some definite motive in reading the newspapers, and the average American is not the sort of a person who wastes his time on things in which he has no confidence.

We have observed too that the shrewd, practical gentlemen who manage the great corporations have detected no marked decline of public confidence in newspapers. Their desire to own newspapers, to influence newspapers, to shape the policy of newspapers was never so keen as it is now. They must believe that the public has confidence in what it reads in newspapers, or they would not be so eager to control newspapers.

What is commonly spoken of as a decline of newspaper influence is in reality only a change for the better. Newspapers are cheaper than they were, and few men are obliged to rely upon a single newspaper. They draw information and opinions not from one source but from two or three or four sources, and their own opinion is the resultant of these various forces. This is having the excellent effect of teaching people to think for themselves. They are the surer in consequence to detect bad advice and the quicker to follow good advice. Their own opinions are clearer and saner and less prejudiced.

This does not mean a decline of newspaper influence. On the contrary, it is a manifestation of the best kind of influence that newspapers can exert.

### MR. PULITZER'S JOURNALISM

[Oct. 31, 1911]

PRACTICALLY all the newspaper estimates of Mr. Pulitzer's work and service agree in their recognition of him as the creator of "a new kind of journalism."

This is true. Mr. Pulitzer did create a new kind of journalism. By means of it he became the great emancipator of the American press. He found it shackled to tradition, to systems and to parties. He struck off its shackles and showed it the way to freedom.

He was the first of the great editors to regard a newspaper not as private property but as public property—not merely as affected with a public interest but animated and inspired by public interest; independent of everything except public interest—independent even of its own proprietor when occasion required.

Mr. Pulitzer's theory of journalism was so simple that it often bewildered friends and opponents alike. His aim was to make a newspaper that would print all the news that ought to be printed without fear or favor; that would present this news in such a manner as to appeal to the widest circle of readers; that would fearlessly attack all forms of wrong and injustice; that would safeguard the weak, restrain the strong and be a great forum of popular self-government; that would hold itself beyond every form of influence except that of the public welfare.

To this end he concentrated all his energy and all his genius. Although he was the owner of *The World* and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, he was in no sense a newspaper publisher. Practically all his knowledge of counting-room affairs was second-hand. He once told the writer of this article that in all the years of his journalistic career he never spent an hour at any one time in the business office.

Nothing connected with *The World* appealed to him less than its income and profits. There was nothing about which he worried less or to which he devoted less thought. Its prosperity was a means, never an end. When business questions were presented to him he was inclined to be

resentful. He disliked to waste time and energy on them which could be devoted to the newspaper itself. To him journalism was never a business; it was the most powerful and responsible profession in which any man could engage.

His chief concern centred in the editorial page as the expression of the paper's conscience, courage and convictions. To that he devoted infinite care and attention. Sick or well, it was never wholly absent from his thoughts. When he was well he had it read to him every day and expressed his opinion about every editorial article, the style in which it was written, the manner in which the thought was expressed, whether the editorial was strong or weak, whether it served any useful public purpose, whether it said the thing that a great newspaper ought to have said.

When ill-health made it impossible for him to have the editorial page read every day he would keep the files for weeks, and then when his condition permitted, he would go over them with painstaking care, always from the point of view of a detached critic, seeking only to determine whether the page was taking the fullest advantage of its opportunities for public service and whether it was measuring up to the high standards that he had set for it.

Nothing was ever allowed to interfere with its independence and its freedom of expression. There were certain questions about which he became convinced that in spite of all his efforts he was possibly prejudiced. In these matters he exacted a pledge that no suggestions or instructions or even commands from him would ever be followed, but that the paper would always say what an independent, untrammelled newspaper ought to say in performing its duties to the people. This pledge was never violated, and nobody respected it more tenaciously than

he himself, even when he was aggressively unsympathetic with the attitude the page sometimes assumed toward the issues in question.

His passionate jealousy of the editorial integrity and independence of *The World* knew no bounds. For that he was ready to sacrifice everything, including himself.

Much has been said about Mr. Pulitzer's marvellous news sense. There was nothing weird or miraculous about it. It was born of an insatiable thirst for information and a restless curiosity about everything of human interest. He wanted to know. What? When? Where? How? He took it for granted that hundreds of thousands of other people wanted to know.

He keenly appreciated the fact that it was necessary to interest people greatly in order to get a hearing for the things that he wished to say. That is why he dressed up the news with pictures. That is why he employed effective stage management in presenting it. That is why he reached out for every kind of news that appealed to human nature. Through that he built up the great editorial power that was the creative pride of his life; for back of everything he did was this dominating motive.

He could not conceive of a great newspaper's doing its real work unless it had a great circulation. To talk to a small number of readers was like talking to a committee. He wanted to talk to mass-meetings. But much as he appreciated the value of a large circulation, he would never seek to acquire it by bending to popular clamor. His detestation of newspaper demagogism was no less virile than his detestation of political demagogism. He would never flatter the public—he would never court its favor by sacrificing his convictions. He hated cant and fraud and false pretenses.

At the time of the Chicago strike he supported Cleveland as vigorously as he attacked him later for the Vene-

zuelan message; yet, Mr. Cleveland's conduct during the Chicago strike was very unpopular with a large element of *The World's* readers, while his Venezuelan message was very popular with an equally large element.

Fifty equally characteristic cases could be cited to show his devotion to the paper's ideals and his magnificent contempt for every sordid consideration that might drag them down.

He has been called the protagonist of personal journalism, and he was. He believed in a journalism that dealt with individuals. But he was the father of an impersonal journalism, too, which had been revolutionizing the attitude of American newspapers toward public persons and public questions. It was a journalism that virtually disregarded the man and dealt only with his actions.

It was this kind of journalism that could support Cleveland in the Debs matter and as strongly oppose him in the Venezuela and secret-bond-sale matters; that could fight Bryan's free-silver theories and uphold his anti-imperialist propaganda; that could praise Roosevelt for the Northern Securities suit, the coal-strike settlement and the Portsmouth peace treaty, while uncompromisingly resisting all his policies of centralization and autocratic government.

No critic of public men was ever more devoid of personal vindictiveness in his editorial treatment of them. He was as glad to praise as to blame, and as ready to blame as to praise. There was no man whom he hesitated to criticise if he thought the criticism was merited, and none whom he hesitated to praise if he thought the praise was deserved. He was a judge who was ever devoid of hate or fear or favor or prejudice in handing down his decrees.

Mr. Pulitzer's idea of a great newspaper was concisely expressed in a cablegram from Rome to the editors

and managers and staff of *The World* on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday—

An institution which should always fight for progress and reform; never tolerate injustice or corruption; always fight demagogues of all parties; never belong to any party; always oppose privileged classes and public plunder; never lack sympathy with the poor; always remain devoted to the public welfare; never be satisfied with merely printing news; always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

This has been *The World's* creed for more than twenty-eight years, and its example has been the most powerful influence exerted upon American journalism during that time. Not an independent newspaper in the country but is more independent because of his work. Not a subservient newspaper but is less subservient. He created a new standard of editorial independence, a new atmosphere of editorial freedom, a new order of editorial responsibility. In all these achievements *The World* remains his monument.

### THIRTY YEARS—A RETROSPECT

[May 10, 1913]

THIRTY years ago today Joseph Pulitzer became the editor and sole proprietor of the New York *World*.

That day marked the beginning of a new journalism in the United States—a journalism that was to be independent of individuals, of private interests, of personal ambition, of political factions and of parties—a journalism devoted unreservedly to public purposes and public principles regardless of all other considerations.

*The World* began its new career with a platform of

policies that were freely denounced as revolutionary and communistic:

1. Tax luxuries
2. Tax inheritances
3. Tax large incomes
4. Tax monopolies
5. Tax the privileges of corporations
6. A tariff for revenue
7. Reform the civil service
8. Punish corrupt office-holders
9. Punish vote-buying
10. Punish employers who coerce their employees in elections.

Today that platform would be regarded as mildly and innocuously conservative in most of its planks. The last remaining issues embodied in that declaration of political faith are in process of actualization in the Congress of the United States.

When Mr. Pulitzer took over a 'discredited newspaper that had been the plaything of Jay Gould, American government was in a state of transition. The war issues were still alive. The Bloody Shirt was a familiar feature of every campaign. The Federal troops had been withdrawn from the South only six years before, and Northern Republicans still regarded that unhappy section of the country as a conquered province.

Nowhere, North or South, was there genuine freedom of elections. The ballot-box was protected by force, not by law. Vote-buying was an established practice. Employers coerced their employees and marched them to the polls on election day to vote according to orders. Elections were commonly carried on by fraud. Seven years before, the Presidency itself had been stolen. Corporations were without restraint. Railroads were the prizes of Wall Street piracy. Corruption was a recognized system of government.



In the course of these thirty years an Interstate Commerce law has completely established the authority of the National Government over railroads engaged in interstate commerce. An Anti-Trust act defines and punishes conspiracies in restraint of trade. A secret ballot has been secured, with an honest count. Corporations have been forbidden by law to contribute to political campaign funds. Both parties and candidates have been compelled by law to publish a full list of their contributions and expenditures. The assessment of office-holders for political purposes has been made a crime. The spoils system has been largely eradicated. New standards of public service and public duty have been created. A new patriotism has arisen that refuses to be shackled within party lines. Trade, finance and industry have undergone a revolution that is no less moral than material, and the Nation has attained a unity in aims and ideals beyond anything heretofore achieved.

In the course of these thirty years Democracy has fought its fight with Plutocracy and triumphed. The supremacy of human rights over property rights has been established. Nothing that has taken place in these three decades is more remarkable than the change in the attitude of the country's captains of money and industry toward the public at large. Wall Street itself would not now tolerate a Jay Gould or a Jim Fisk. The greatest corporation in the United States, with its thousand million dollars of capital, would not assert a right to manage its affairs regardless of the public interest or regardless of the welfare of its employees. Property has moved forward to the advanced ground that radicalism once held, and radicalism has moved on to fields once undreamed of.

No man can study the history of the American people during its various epochs without being profoundly impressed by their steady mental, moral and political progress. Each generation has a higher code and a higher

standard than its predecessors. Each has a firmer grip upon fundamental principles and a broader understanding of the issues presented to it. There have been nominal reactions in American politics, but none endured for long.

This is not merely a richer or a more numerous people than it was in 1883. It is a more intelligent people and a more ethical people. It has a saner public opinion, a more alert national conscience and a finer sense of justice. And *The World* ventures to say, in no spirit of boasting or self-glorification, that the inspiring history of these thirty years might have been vastly different but for the new American journalism that Joseph Pulitzer created thirty years ago today.

Human progress, remarked Lecky, rarely means more than a surplus of advantages over evils. It will always be so. The struggle for liberty is mainly a struggle against the abuses of authority. Oppression is always Privilege, buttressed by law of one kind or another. Progress is less the enactment of legislation to promote popular welfare than the repeal and modification of legislation which sacrifices the many to the advantages of the few. Issues change, but principles remain eternal, and there is no truce in the battle for human rights.

Thus, regardless of changing conditions and changing issues, *The World* stands today where it stood thirty years ago, fighting the same fight for the same principles, keeping the same faith, dedicated to the same ideals of public service and public duty.

SEDITION!

[January 13, 1920]

It has long been the practice of *The World Almanac* to print the Declaration of Independence each year. In

fact, the late Joseph Pulitzer once issued an order that the Declaration of Independence must be published in every issue of *The World Almanac*, and his wishes have been as scrupulously respected since his death as they were during his lifetime.

This year, however, we are torn by doubts and misgivings. *The World Almanac* for 1920 has already been printed and tens of thousands of copies have been distributed and cannot be recalled; but the Almanac again contains the Declaration of Independence, and the new Sedition Bill as agreed to by the House Judiciary Committee provides that any person shall be deemed guilty of a felony "who either orally or by writing, printing or the use of any sign, symbol, picture, caricature, or shall otherwise teach, incite, advocate, propose or advise, or aid, abet or encourage forcible resistance to or destruction of the Government of the United States, its Constitution, laws and authority, or the Governments of the several States, all or any of them, or the existence of constituted government generally."

Now, unfortunately, the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence is defiantly seditious, in that it proclaims—

That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.

We are willing, of course, as a law-abiding institution, to dissociate ourselves completely henceforth from the incendiary sentiments of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, John Hancock, Roger Sherman, Samuel Adams, Robert Morris and the other mischievous radicals who signed this document. But, as we have already said, *The World Almanac* for 1920 has already been printed, and *The World* has been engaged in circulating a document that on its face is hideously seditious, a document that is about to be banned by the law, a document that most impudently insists that there are circumstances in which "forcible resistance" either to government or to the "laws and authority" of government may be justified, and that shows no proper regard whatever for "constituted government generally."

*The World* can easily suppress the Declaration of Independence in all future editions of the Almanac, but in the mean time the mischief has been done for 1920 and the seditious utterances of Thomas Jefferson have been scattered to the four corners of the country.

For any evil consequences that may ensue, in which case *The World* can be indicted as an accessory before the fact, we can only beg for mercy and for such consideration as the Department of Justice may graciously grant.

Sedition is sedition, and the acts of Congress, whatever they may be, are part of the supreme law of the land. Down with the Declaration of Independence!

## CHAPTER XI

### THE WAR

IT is very easy now for a commentator upon the part played by the United States in the War to say what a statesman should have done, what an adviser and moulder of public thought should have written, at various stages of the conflict. It was easy even at the time for men and women whose emotions were stirred to fever pitch by the great conflict, and who were restrained by no responsibility toward the people, to use violent language in favor, for instance, of early intervention, or attacking those whose sad and weary task it was to guide national action. On the whole, the editorials of Mr. Cobb in *The World*, read in the memory of after events, furnish an accurate transcript of the mental processes by which the prevailing thought of the country arrived reluctantly at the conclusion that war was inevitable. Needless to say, *The World* was as energetic in supporting the war as it was later eloquent in dispraise of post-war tyrannies.

### AN INDICTMENT OF CIVILIZATION

[August 1, 1914]

IN Vienna, there is a doddering old man, the offspring of a tainted house, who sits on the throne of the dual empire.

In St. Petersburg, there is a weak, well-meaning neu-

rotic who by the accident of birth happens to be the Czar of All the Russias.

In Berlin, there is a brilliant, talented, ambitious manipulator of politics who is German Emperor by grace of the genius of Bismarck, Moltke and Roon.

Of these three men, only the one in Berlin has more than mediocre abilities; yet the three are permitted to play with the lives of millions of men, with property worth thousands of millions of dollars, with the commerce and industry and prosperity and laws and institutions not merely of empires and kingdoms but of continents. It is left to them to determine whether the world is to witness the most deadly and devastating war of all history.

The thing would be laughable, ridiculous, if it were not so ghastly.

War of itself may be wise or unwise, just or unjust; but that the issue of a world-wide war should rest in the hands of three men—any three men—and that the hundreds of millions who will bear the burden and be affected in every relation of life by the outcome of such a war should passively leave the decision to those three men is an indictment of civilization itself.

Human progress is slow indeed when a whole continent is still ready to fight for anything except the right to life, liberty and self-government.

### AUTOCRACY OR DEMOCRACY

[August 4, 1914]

O great corrector of enormous times,  
Shaker of o'er-rank states, thou grand decider  
Of dusty and old titles, that healest with blood  
The earth when it is sick, and then curest the world  
O' the pleurisy of people!

BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER

WHEN peace is again established in Europe there will come a new order of things. Democracy will not stand

forever upon the scaffold, with autocracy forever on the throne.

Ten days ago the German people were at peace with all the world. They had no quarrel of their own with anybody. In the years that had followed the downfall of Napoleon III, they had won the admiration of every civilized country. Out of a condition of general poverty, they had arisen to great wealth and prosperity. They had become the leaders and teachers of all the nations in the development of scientific industry. Their commerce reached to every nook and corner of the globe. Their ships floated on every sea. Their victories were no victories of brute force, but triumphs of applied skill and trained minds. In many respects the Germans had touched the highwater mark of human civilization. There was not another country in the world but could learn something from them.

Suddenly this vast fabric, woven by peace and industry and skill and science, is torn in two. All the machinery of progress is stopped by the hand of autocracy. The Kaiser plunges Europe into the most devastating conflict known to human history, and every civilized country reels under the shock. And about what? Ostensibly because Russia had answered Austria's wanton war against Serbia by mobilizing troops on the frontier in order to protect her own interests. In reality because the reactionary party of Germany was determined to invite a general European conflict in order to stay the advancement of political reforms.

In the very vanguard of the twentieth century in most respects, Germany has straggled back to the seventeenth century politically. The curse of medieval government has hung over her noblest achievements. Every impulse toward political freedom has been beaten back by the mailed fist, and at a great crisis in their history the German people are deprived of that power over their own

political institutions without which the English-speaking races have justly come to regard life itself as intolerable.

Autocracy has had its way. Austria's quarrel with Servia was no affair of the German people. Russia's challenge to Austria was no affair of the German people. Yet the very fate of the German Empire is thrown into the balance in order to halt the march of political freedom in Europe.

All the world knew that a declaration of war against Russia was in effect a declaration of war against France. Germany admitted it by mobilizing her army not on the Russian frontier but on the French frontier. The decisive blow was to be struck against the French Republic, not against its imperial ally. It was not Russian despotism that was to be crushed but French republicanism.

The hollow hypocrisy of the whole proceeding is revealed in the fact that before the clash of arms is fairly begun the Austrian invasion of Servia is practically abandoned.

Having begun the war, German autocracy now finds itself isolated. Italy construes the Triple Alliance as applicable only to a war of defense; because there would be a revolution in Italy if the Government ventured to champion the cause of the hated Austrian. Great Britain is compelled to make France's cause her cause. Germany and Austria are left alone to fight the battle of autocracy and pay the bill in blood and treasure and prestige. In this war they have no sympathizers even among neutrals. The enlightened opinion of the whole world has turned against the two Kaisers as it turned against Napoleon III when he sought to make himself the autocrat of Europe.

What was begun hastily as a war of autocracy is not unlikely to end as a war of revolution, with thrones crumbling and dynasties in exile. Civilization cannot rest at the mercy of despotism, and the welfare of mankind is not to be made the plaything of autocracy. If all



Europe must be drenched in blood before this lesson is implanted in the minds of kings and courtiers, we may say of this war as Lincoln said of the war that exterminated human slavery: "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

This is the twilight of the gods.

### WE ALSO

[September 29, 1915]

THERE will be a pathetic parade today in Washington of the remnant of the Grand Army.

Perhaps it will be the last of the street demonstrations with which the country has been familiar for more than a generation, for the men are old and most of them can march no more, but for many a year to come there will be reunions of these venerable Americans, and, as was the case with the Revolutionary ancestors of some of them, the survivors will be honored to the end.

If as a result of existing complications at home and abroad any of our people are inclined to question the nationality of the United States or to be unduly disturbed by vexatious foreign influences, let them consider what this Grand Army was and what it did.

Made up of soldiers of every race, nation and creed, but all American in faith and spirit, it defended and preserved the Union. It settled forever the quibbles, the jealousies, the doubts, the conspiracies, the treasons of those who hoped to prevail against a divided people. It re-established a Nation to the end that "government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

We also have a Fatherland.

## WILL CONGRESS HAUL DOWN THE FLAG

[March 3, 1916]

THERE is only one issue in the controversy between the President and Congress: Shall the foreign policy of the United States Government be determined in Washington or in Berlin?

No other question is involved. The dispute about armed merchantmen is only the John Doe proceedings by which the case has been brought into court.

Every German-language newspaper in the country is against the President and for the resolutions on which Mr. Wilson has demanded a vote.

Every pro-German newspaper, including the New York *American*, the New York *Evening Mail*, the Chicago *Tribune* and the Milwaukee *Free Press*, is against the President and for the resolutions.

All the influence of a mobilized pro-German propaganda has been swung against the President. The manner in which manufactured public opinion is brought to bear upon Congress may be judged from an appeal made by the *Staats-Zeitung* to its readers:

The time has come for every individual American citizen to communicate with his Congressman, by post or telegraph, on the vital issues which are being placed by the President before Congress.

Only in this way can your representative be enlightened as to your views.

If you do not know your Congressman's name, call up the *Staats-Zeitung*—phone Beekman 4300—at any time after 9 o'clock A.M., and it will be given you.

Individual letters will have the greatest effect, but the following form has been suggested:

"As one of your constituents, I feel at liberty to address you in connection with the present momentous issues before the Congress.

"It is my firm conviction that the best interests of the country will be subserved by keeping it out of the war which is ravaging Europe today, and that to the end of keeping it out of the war the Congress should warn American citizens from traveling on armed vessels of the belligerents or on vessels of belligerent nations known to espouse the principle that a merchantman is permitted to arm 'for defensive purposes only.'"

A congressman will pay more attention to a letter from a voter in his district than he will to all the learned scriptures emanating from the countless other Congressional districts of the United States.

It is possible that many of the Congressional supporters of these resolutions to reverse the foreign policy of the United States in the interest of Germany are as credulous and irresponsible as Senator Gore, who introduced his resolution because he had heard an unsubstantiated rumor that the President was in favor of war with Germany, and was "apprehensive" and "feared it might be true." Senator Gore has yet to reveal the sources of this rumor, which seems to have originated in a threat made by the German Ambassador. If he "feared it might be true," he could easily have made inquiries of the President, yet he sought no such information. Whatever Senator Gore's motives may have been at the outset, the issue has now become a clean-cut contest between pro-Americanism and pro-Germanism in the conduct of our foreign relations.

Whoever votes for those resolutions votes for German diplomacy against American diplomacy. Whoever supports these resolutions supports Germany against the United States. Whoever defends these resolutions defends German lawlessness against American rights and American honor. Whoever tries to prevent a vote on these resolutions in order to evade the question is helping to make it impossible henceforth for the United States to maintain international law against foreign aggression.

For more than a year the German propaganda has been preparing for a drive on Congress. The clash was inevitable, and while nobody could foresee the bloody angle at which the issue would be fought, the conflict might as well come now as at any time. The sooner it is settled the better, and if in the opinion of an American Congress the United States has no rights that Germany is bound to respect, we cannot know it too soon.

Senator John Sharp Williams bluntly declared yesterday that "the President has been brought to this situation by Senators who represented the pleas of foreign capitals." Whoever doubts it has only to observe the instant response of the pro-German propaganda to the resolutions to strip the President of all power, prestige and influence in conducting the foreign affairs of the country. This propaganda has been against the United States in every diplomatic controversy with Germany since the beginning of the war. It is a propaganda that in itself has made war against the peace, the dignity and the security of the United States. Its purpose now is to capture Congress and turn Congress against the President in order that the United States should remain helpless to enforce the rights of American citizens against German aggression while the war continues.

We do not care what excuses or apologies or explanations Congressmen make for the aid and comfort that they give this enemy propaganda. We do not care whether they are idealists who believe in peace at any price, or whether they are Bryan or Hearst factionists who desire to pull down the President, or Republicans and Rooseveltites who would gladly shame and discredit the United States for the sake of scoring a partisan advantage over the President, or pro-Germans who are seeking to promote the military advantage of Germany at the expense of American rights and American honor, they are all engaged in the same infamous business.

In the solemn words uttered by Senator Williams yesterday, "There are times when there are irrepressible conflicts. The time has now come when we must settle this question of America." Does Congress purpose to haul down the flag?

### "PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY"

[January 24, 1917]

PRESIDENT WILSON uttered a profound historical truth when he asserted in his address to the Senate that a durable peace "must be a peace without victory."

And what is a peace without victory? The classical example of modern times is furnished by the American Civil War. The North completely crushed the military power of the Southern Confederacy. It made an end to slavery and secession, but it imposed no conquerors' terms upon the vanquished.

The Southern States were brought back into the Union as they had been before the war. The Southern leaders and soldiers were restored to citizenship without pains or penalties. One of them today is Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the greatest judicial tribunal in the world. "Only a peace between equals can last," said President Wilson, and the peace that followed the Civil War was a peace between equals.

Even in the war of 1866 with Austria, Bismarck aroused the bitter enmity of the Prussian General Staff and the military party by refusing to allow the army to have a voice in deciding the terms of peace. When the Austrial military power was broken and humbled, the war ended, and Austria was not treated as a vanquished and prostrate enemy.

Wars are usually the product of previous wars, and

the present conflict can be traced by successive steps back to the Congress of Vienna which undertook to nullify the French Revolution after the overthrow of Napoleon, and turn back the hands of the clock to absolutism and despotism. In other words, the Congress of Vienna imposed the peace of victory upon Europe at an ultimate cost in life and treasure which staggers the human imagination.

Speaking as a historian as well as a Chief Magistrate, President Wilson is warning Europe against a repetition of the ghastly blunders of the past which could only breed another war of greater magnitude than this. A peace without victory means simply that no permanent peace can be imposed by the sword. It does not mean that the Allies shall not crush Germany's military power if they can. It does not mean that they shall not crumple up the German armies and occupy Berlin if that be possible. Neither does it mean that the Germans shall not occupy Paris if they can get to Paris or invade England if they can reach England. It places no limitations upon the extent or completeness of military occupations; but it emphatically affirms that the terms of peace ought not to be dictated by the success of such operations. A peace without victory does not imply a war without victory; but it most certainly implies that a durable peace must be a peace of justice and humanity, not merely a peace of the sword.

Such a message as that of the President is not directed wholly to Governments or primarily to Governments. It is directed to mankind. It is a message to the democracies of the world, and whatever force it has in safeguarding the future must result from the effectiveness of its appeal to those democracies. What the common people think of it is of infinitely more importance than what Cabinets and Senates and rulers and newspapers think of it.

That the message has not fallen upon deaf ears where it ought to be heard is proved by the cheers that greeted

the mention of President Wilson's name at the great conference of the British Labor party at Manchester, England, yesterday—a conference that applauded the President of the United States and gave its unqualified support to the British Government in carrying on the war. Those men have not mistaken the meaning of the President's words and they are not troubled by doubts about his motives. It is only the mind of partyism and Toryism which persists in misunderstanding Mr. Wilson's message.

The President has not undertaken to define the terms of peace to Europe, but he has undertaken to define the fundamental principles of peace, and if those principles are not true, then the Declaration of Independence is a living lie.

### WHAT THE PRESIDENT PROPOSES

[January 26, 1917]

MUCH skill and ingenuity have been devoted both at home and abroad to misunderstanding President Wilson's address to the Senate.

The average critic instantly puts himself into the state of mind of the Berlin editor who asked, "What does he mean? Is he for us or against us?" and its real significance is totally disregarded.

Even the most casual reading of the address will show that the President has expressly disclaimed all intention of prescribing the terms of peace. He has said as plainly as language can say it:

We shall have no voice in determining what those terms will be.

Whatever they are, we are bound to accept them, and no American Government "would throw any obstacle in

the way of any terms of peace or seek to upset them when made, whatever they might be." The President has not ventured to say that either side must make peace "without victory" or that it must make peace at all. What he has done is to describe the conditions and define the principles of a peace that the United States will help guarantee and make permanent.

Victorious belligerents are free to impose any terms of peace that they please, but the President has made it plain that the United States will not help to guarantee a peace imposed at the point of the sword, which can only lead to another war.

His address in that respect admits of no misinterpretation that is not intentional or the product of ignorance.

The Allies, in their reply to the President's note, referred to the measures that must be taken to insure the future peace of the world, and specified "agreements which must imply the sanctions necessary to secure their execution and thus prevent an apparent security from only facilitating new aggressions." Mr. Balfour, in his supplemental note to the United States, named three essentials of a permanent peace, the third of which is that—

behind international law and all treaty arrangements for preventing or limiting hostilities, some form of international sanction should be devised which would give pause to the hardest aggressor.

The President has described the general political conditions that must exist in Europe before such international sanctions can be devised or the United States be a party to them. To use his exact words:

The present war must first be ended, but we owe it to candor and a just regard for the opinion of mankind to say that so far as our participation in the guarantees of future



peace is concerned, it makes a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it is ended. The treaties and agreements which bring it to an end must embody terms which will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind, not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged.

The general principles of such a peace the President finds embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Monroe Doctrine, and he submits these principles to the consideration of all the belligerents, as he has a right to do. They may accept them or reject them, as they please. They may impose such terms of peace as they are able to impose, but they are warned in advance that the United States will not undertake to help make those terms permanent unless they square with the principles of liberty and justice which are "fundamental and essential as a condition precedent to permanency."

Nobody in his right mind would expect the United States to help guarantee a peace that gave Belgium over to Germany and despoiled France. Nor could anybody in his right mind expect the United States to help guarantee a peace that dismembered Germany and Austria-Hungary and left them prostrate before the advance of Russian despotism. These are the extreme examples of the possibilities of a victorious peace, but there are a score of other examples that cannot be disregarded if the peace is to be more than an armed truce.

President Wilson has brought to the solution of these world-problems American principles and American policies. He has defined the only kind of peace "which the peoples of America could join in guaranteeing," and it is little to the credit either of American intelligence or American patriotism that the most venomous critics of the President's proposals are citizens of the United States who call themselves Americans.

1796 OR 1917?

[January 30, 1917]

THE policy of isolation that was urged upon the American people in Washington's Farewell Address was constructed upon this hypothesis:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote connection. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns.

This was true in 1796 when the United States was a great experiment in self-government, when there was no steamship, no railroad, no cable, no wireless, when the Republic was geographically as well as politically isolated from the rest of the world; but is it true today?

Will anybody affirm that the primary interests of British democracy differ essentially from our own primary interests? Or French democracy? Or Italian democracy? Or even the mass of Germans for whom Maximilian Harden alone has the courage and vision to be the spokesman? Various European Governments may have interests which are foreign to our interests, but even there can we say that those interests do not concern us?

June 28, 1914, a double murder was committed in a street of Sarajevo, a town in Bosnia. Although the victims were an Austrian Archduke and Archduchess, nothing in 1796 would have been of less concern to the United States than a crime perpetrated in a Balkan province of Austria-Hungary.

Yet this murder in Sarajevo brought the United States to the verge of another civil war. It will cost the American people thousands of millions of dollars in taxation. It has set back for half a century the work of assimilating

the immigrant population of this country. It has diverted the mind of the Nation from its most vital domestic problems. It has all but embroiled us in the most ghastly war of human history. It has complicated our affairs with the whole world, disorganized all internal affairs, and in a way left us denationalized, divided into hostile camps of European tribesmen.

If the fundamental principle of Washington's Farewell Address still has vital force, what happened in Sarajevo was "essentially foreign to our concerns." Nevertheless, we all know what has befallen us, and the question is whether we are to sit by and permit it to happen again without having anything to say about it.

Had there been almost any kind of council of the nations, this war could never have taken place. Conference and discussion alone would have averted it. The war was possible only because a secret and tortuous diplomacy made it possible. But had Vienna, dealing at first with Belgrade and then with Petrograd, known that it would have to reckon in the end with all the civilized nations, there would have been no ultimatum to Serbia.

This war marked the collapse of the system of entangling alliances intriguing for the balance of power. Civilization, in its own interest, is now compelled to take a step forward. Is American democracy to hold aloof? Have we no obligations whatever to the rest of mankind which would impel us to throw our influence into the balance to prevent a repetition of this war? Because George Washington in 1796 wisely decided that a policy of isolation was then for the best interest of the United States, must we refuse to admit that there has been any change in the world since 1796 and that our interests and obligations now are precisely what they were then?

The men who are against the participation by the United States in a League to Enforce Peace on the ground that it conflicts with Washington's Farewell Ad-

'dress are spiritual brothers of the men who ardently defended the institution of slavery on the ground that George Washington was a slave-owner. What was moral in 1796 was still moral in 1860 to the Southern slaveholder. What was a wise foreign policy in 1796 is still a wise foreign policy to the mandarins of the United States Senate who can never believe that the world moves forward.

Before many months have elapsed the American people must decide for themselves whether the United States in relation to the other nations is living in the year 1796 or the year 1917. Are they ready to co-operate with the other great countries in the common interest, or are they by the policy of isolation to invite the other great countries to co-operate against them? It will inevitably be one or the other.

### WITHOUT FEAR AND WITHOUT REPROACH

[February 4, 1917]

THE United States is now on the verge of war with Germany, but the American people can face the crisis without fear and without reproach.

The national conscience is clear. In all the records of history there will be found no other example of a great and powerful nation exerting such effort and making such sacrifices to keep the peace as the United States has done in the course of its relations with Germany since Aug. 1, 1914.

Now that the break has come and German ruthlessness has made it necessary for this Government, in sustaining the honor and dignity of the United States, to sever diplomatic relations with the German Government, we can still say in the proud words of the President's ad-

'dress to Congress yesterday that "We wish to serve no selfish ends. We seek merely to stand true alike in thought and action to the immemorial principles of our people." And these, as he truly said, "are the bases of peace, not war."

If war now comes it is not of our making. We shall not provoke it by murdering helpless German non-combatants or by destroying German property or by proclaiming maritime anarchy. Even with diplomatic relations severed as a final protest against barbarism Germany can still have peace with the United States by recognizing the elementary rights of neutrals and returning to the rules of cruiser warfare. There need be no war unless Germany commits an overt act of war, and if the German Government has not given itself over completely to military madness there is still time for it to withdraw from the precipice.

President Wilson has been patient indeed, but it is a patience that he has shared with a majority of the American people, and it is not to be regretted. The President's desire to keep the country out of war, if honorable means could be found, has been their desire, and it is nothing that requires apology or extenuation. If he has failed, it is a noble and enlightened failure which does honor to the President and to the Nation. We are not alone in that misfortune. Other nations endeavored to keep the peace with Germany and failed, and at worst our failure merely testifies to a national idealism that was willing to submit even to wrong and insult in order to keep the fires of peace burning somewhere upon the altars of civilization.

If all our efforts have come to naught, and we, too, must be plunged into the crater of calamity, let us at least thank God that we shall enter the war on the right side; that we shall be fighting the fight of democracy; that we shall be battling for the principles of human liberty that

are the flesh and bone and soul of the Republic; that we shall be upholding the faith of the fathers who gave to mankind a new birth of freedom.

The President of the United States has spoken and his words are the words of 100,000,000 American citizens. It is a time for the searching of hearts. It is no time for jingoism, or for tawdry manifestation of pseudo patriotism. Most emphatically it is no time for chauvinistic anti-German demonstrations and cheap exhibitions of race antagonism. Americans today have only one duty, and that is to stand unflinchingly in support of their government and be resolved to sustain it in the defense of liberty and justice, come what may.

*"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it."*

## ON THE EVE OF WAR

### A Recollection.

PRESIDENT WILSON had a way of summoning Cobb to Washington. Cobb rarely spoke of these visits to the White House. Since Wilson's death two of Cobb's associates, Maxwell Anderson and Laurence Stallings, have written down their memory of his recollection of one such occasion which is history. Mr. Anderson remembers that something said in disparagement of Clemenceau gave the impetus to the revelation; Mr. Anderson continues:

"'He was a tricky old bandit,' said Cobb, as the three of us entered his office. 'A tricky old bandit, but he knew the game. He was the most formidable person at Versailles when it came to a pinch. Lloyd George was a child beside him. W. W. knew it, and knew how to meet the old boy, but he was hampered by having ideals of justice and government. Clemenceau used to look at Wil-

son as if he were a new and disconcerting species. He thought Wilson had the Messiah complex.

"He was dead wrong about it though, and everybody who thinks Wilson didn't know his way about and didn't know what he was in for should have heard what he said about the war before he went in. Old W. W. knew his history. He knew what wars were fought for, and what they do to nations that wage them.

"The night before he asked Congress for a declaration of war against Germany he sent for me. I was late getting the message somehow and didn't reach the White House till 1 o'clock in the morning. "The old man" was waiting for me, sitting in his study with the typewriter on his table, where he used to type his own messages.

"I'd never seen him so worn down. He looked as if he hadn't slept, and he said he hadn't. He said he was probably going before Congress the next day to ask a declaration of war, and he'd never been so uncertain about anything in his life as about that decision. For nights, he said, he'd been lying awake going over the whole situation; over the provocation given by Germany, over the probable feeling in the United States, over the consequences to the settlement and to the world at large if we entered the melee.

"He tapped some sheets before him and said that he had written a message and expected to go before Congress with it as it stood. He said he couldn't see any alternative, that he had tried every way he knew to avoid war. "I think I know what war means," he said, and he added that if there were any possibility of avoiding war he wanted to try it. "What else can I do?" he asked. "Is there anything else I can do?"

"I told him his hand had been forced by Germany, that so far as I could see we couldn't keep out.

"Yes," he said, "but do you know what that means?" He said war would overturn the world we had

known; that so long as we remained out there was a preponderance of neutrality, but that if we joined with the Allies the world would be off the peace basis and onto a war basis.

“It would mean that we should lose our heads along with the rest and stop weighing right and wrong. It would mean that a majority of people in this hemisphere would go war-mad, quit thinking and devote their energies to destruction. The President said a declaration of war would mean that Germany would be beaten and so badly beaten that there would be a dictated peace, a victorious peace.

““It means,” he said, “an attempt to reconstruct a peace-time civilization with war standards, and at the end of the war there will be no bystanders with sufficient power to influence the terms. There won’t be any peace standards left to work with. There will be only war standards.”

“The President said that such a basis was what the Allies thought they wanted, and that they would have their way in the very thing America had hoped against and struggled against. W. W. was uncanny that night. He had the whole panorama in his mind. He went on to say that so far as he knew he had considered every loophole of escape and as fast as they were discovered Germany deliberately blocked them with some new outrage.

“Then he began to talk about the consequences to the United States. He had no illusions about the fashion in which we were likely to fight the war.

“He said when a war got going it was just war and there weren’t two kinds of it. It required illiberalism at home to reinforce the men at the front. We couldn’t fight Germany and maintain the ideals of Government that all thinking men shared. He said we would try it but it would be too much for us.



" "Once lead this people into war," he said, "and they'll forget there ever was such a thing as tolerance. To fight you must be brutal and ruthless, and the spirit of ruthless brutality will enter into the very fibre of our national life, infecting Congress, the courts, the policeman on the beat, the man in the street." Conformity would be the only virtue, said the President, and every man who refused to conform would have to pay the penalty.

"He thought the Constitution would not survive it; that free speech and the right of assembly would go. He said a nation couldn't put its strength into a war and keep its head level; it had never been done.

" "If there is any alternative, for God's sake, let's take it," he exclaimed. Well I couldn't see any, and I told him so.

"The President didn't have illusions about how he was going to come out of it, either. He'd rather have done anything else than head a military machine. All his instincts were against it. He foresaw too clearly the probable influence of a declaration of war on his own fortunes; the adulation certain to follow the certain victory, the derision and attack which would come with the deflation of excessive hopes and in the presence of world responsibility. But if he had it to do over again he would take the same course. It was just a choice of evils.' "

## DOWNFALL

[November 9, 1918]

THE desperate adventure for which a Germany worshipping false gods has been preparing for many years ended yesterday in acknowledged defeat and humiliation.

For this foray many shibboleths and oriflammes were

made to order and long cherished as in a holy cause. The toast was always to "The Day!" The battle-cry was "World Power or Downfall!" which was inscribed upon every banner. The plan was "Frightfulness."

It is not World Power. It is not Mitteleuropa. It is not Berlin to Bagdad. It is not an earth once largely free bowing in the dust before a medieval Kaiser speaking for Gott and claiming powers Divine as well as human. It is downfall.

Formally asking Marshal Foch for an armistice the drastic terms of which were known in advance, and at any rate could be construed from those accorded to Bulgaria, Turkey and Austria-Hungary, the military representatives of Germany have in effect published their surrender. If the further prosecution of a wicked war of aggression had been possible, the historic meeting of yesterday somewhere on La Capelle Road in Aisne would not have taken place. This is not a treaty of peace, but unmistakably a surrender.

In its most important aspect it is a surrender unexampled in the history of the world, for it confirms the death of autocracy. As was necessary and just, the first tawdry institution to capitulate was autocracy itself. When imperial Germany, under the pressure of arms, accepted Woodrow Wilson's ultimatum, as to responsible popular government, it gained a liberation which its own docile population never was able and hardly ever tried to secure by its own exertion.

The surrender to Marshal Foch completes the overthrow and the deliverance. It is a military surrender, and so it exposes militarism in its final and calamitous rôle of failure. It is a civic surrender also, and so it leaves Pan-Germanism, Junkerism and all the other evil forces of tyranny and aggression stripped of every pretense and every falsehood in the presence of a people too long deceived and misled.

By this surrender we have the final justification of the awful sacrifices of France, Great Britain, Italy, and even Russia in the early days. By this surrender Americans may know, and forever glory in the fact, that their timely participation in the war has saved not only the heroic free nations of Europe but made their own future secure.

We raised the great armies, we poured out the money, we provided the food, we gave of counsel and sympathy and inspiration so lavishly that freedom, almost in despair, and humanity, staggered by barbarism and treachery, took new courage and pressed on. Our blood has mingled with the best blood of Europe. Whether tardily or not, we rescued civilization, and its triumph is our triumph.

It is a great price that militarism pays for its crimes. How else could they be expiated? Militarism, always affronting mankind with the clenched fist and the shining sword, is disarmed. Militarism can have no peace except upon terms that render it helpless. Militarism has been beaten at its own game. The disciplined forces of militarism yield at every point to the hurriedly assembled hosts of democracy.

Beleaguered on land and on sea, 'defeated on every battle-line, abandoned by its 'deceived and shattered accomplices, starved and bankrupted at home and threatened on all sides with invasion and revolution, what could militarism do but surrender?

Germany relied upon its army, which was superior to the state. The free peoples relied upon their citizenship, which is the very foundation of the state. The result, foreshadowed from the first, is before us.

France, doomed to death, lives. Great Britain, consigned to decrepitude, lives. Italy, marked for revengeful punishment, lives. The United States, set aside for blackmail and other Prussian forms of plunder, lives.

Belgium, Serbia and Roumania, all but exhausted, are quickened and restored. Neutral nations and peoples, long harassed and wronged on all sides and fearing most of all a triumphant Germany—all these live with new hopes.

Only autocracy and militarism have died, and they have been killed by the one power that they have always recognized, which is force.

That force is revealed at home as well as upon the battle-lines. It expresses itself intellectually and socially in loosened tongues and in popular tumult and revolt. We, therefore, as well as the Germans, are spectators of the day of judgment for autocracy.

If there is anybody on earth, even in Germany or in Austria-Hungary or in the sodden precincts of the Sublime Porte, to plead its miserable cause, where is he and who is he?

A few hours may elapse before the final and authoritative capitulation takes place, but the solemn ceremony of yesterday in the presence of smoking guns, momentarily silenced, was the sure forerunner of surrender and a dictated peace.

## SEEDS OF NEW WARS

[December 6, 1918]

It was comparatively easy for the people of the United States to accept President Wilson's brief summary last January of the purposes of this Government in the war. In the course of time the Western Allies found inspiration in his words, and finally, with reservation as to one point, accepted them.

Men's souls were tried during the first six months of the present year as never before during the conflict.

The question was whether the power of the United States could be exerted in time to save the day. While the fate of the world hung in the balance the ideals of liberty, justice and peace which were gloriously borne upon American bayonets were everywhere applauded, and even Germany, as the hour of its overthrow approached, embraced them.

With victory a great change is to be noticed. American politicians who were silent a few weeks ago are now discovering that the Fourteen Points are indefinite and that some of them run counter to our interests or prejudices. In England a considerable section of the press is asking with well-simulated tones of injury why any visionary altruism on the part of American dreamers or British mobocrats should deprive the empire of any of its pretensions, whether right or wrong.

This is all very human. When men are scared they go piously to their prayers and then, as confidence returns, they are apt to forget closet and altar. On occasions when weighty affairs are at stake they are voluble in propounding lofty principles and creeds which too often are forgotten when an opportunity for action arrives. It is easy to promise. It is difficult to fulfil.

If we were asked to put Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points into one, we should say that his purpose was to make this war the end of war. A suffering world so interpreted it. Everything that he suggested led up to that idea. His splendid hope nerved every soldier of democracy, and so far as the enemy came finally to comprehend the aspiration it removed to some extent the bitterness of his defeat.

Neither this war nor any other war will ever end war unless victors and vanquished move forward from the old ruts of greed, arrogance and suspicion. How important it is that what is to be done must be done quickly is shown by the activity of the forces of reaction.

The dead are hardly buried, the wounded still languish, the scourged peoples still hunger and the guns have not yet cooled, and yet Toryism and jingoism are at work for bigger armaments, trade restrictions and territorial acquisitions, just as though the war had been fought solely for vengeance and conquest.

Ideals are not realized upon the battle-field. Bloodshed only opens the way for them. If the Western democracies under the leadership of Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando cannot make secure at the peace table the aims which carried their armies to triumph, we are going to have as a result of this war nothing but a tragic memory and a burden of debt which will afflict generations unborn.

It was Machiavelli, the practical politician and cynic, who said that "each treaty plants the seeds of a new war." Have men learned nothing since his evil day? Treaties plant the seeds of new wars only as the men who make them are selfish and cruel.

## PEACE OR ANARCHY

[January 1, 1919]

THE year 1918 was the year of Victory. Will 1919 be the year of Peace or the year of Anarchy?

Whether Europe is to be republican or Bolshevik is almost certain to be determined by the events of the next six months, and in particular by the deliberations of the Peace Conference, which must deal with the most complicated problem of human relationship that has ever confronted a Congress of the Nations.

The greater part of Europe has collapsed politically as a result of war and is without government that possesses the elements of permanence or established author-

ity. All of Europe, including Great Britain, is exhausted economically and must resume the arduous task of recreating the wealth that has been blown from the mouths of cannon during the last four years. Although Germany is beaten and has surrendered, the German situation today presents possibilities of danger that are quite as disturbing as the menace of Prussianism itself. A Bolshevik Germany may easily mean a Bolshevik Europe. The forces that German autocracy financed and set at work in Russia are now reacting upon the German people, and if they succumb, nobody is wise enough to foresee when and how this anarchy can be checked in its advancing sweep.

The doctrine of the confiscation of property was never before so alluring as it is now when millions of men have been engaged for years in the work of systematic destruction of property under the direction of their own Governments and when they have learned from personal experience the full meaning of organized force. While Americans still persist in discussing the situation in political terms, Europe itself is thinking in economic terms, and inevitably so, for the problems of peace are basically economical.

There can be no guarantee of political stability until the economic foundations of the world are again laid. Even the very idealism that is insistently pressing its demands at the peace table has an economic origin which is to be found in the intense desire of the masses in Europe to emancipate themselves from the burden of armaments and war and to have a peace that will guarantee to them the fruits of their labor. Unless these demands can be satisfied at the Peace Conference, the Bolshevik movement will receive an impetus that may make it uncontrollable.

In so far as the war was a conflict between democracy and autocracy it has been won, but out of it has come

a war between 'democracy and anarchy which threatens every institution of modern civilization. Never in all history has there been a mightier need for wise statesmanship and sure political vision than now. Never did heavier responsibilities rest upon the leaders of political and economic thought in every country.

For good or evil, the year 1919 is bound to mark the beginning of a new era. That was settled when the guns ceased firing and the German plenipotentiaries signed the armistice that was drafted at Versailles. It will be no neutral year in the world's history, but the year that determines the new destiny of mankind with all that that implies.

### LUENDORFF'S STORY

[September 7, 1919]

THE WORLD today begins the publication of the memoirs of Ludendorff and Tirpitz, the one Chief of Staff of the German Armies, the other Grand Admiral of the German Navy and director of German sea policy.

Both of these men were central figures in the great tragedy that ended in the overthrow of the Hohenzollerns and the downfall of Imperial Germany. Their narrative of the conflict, be it good or bad, true or false, impartial or 'distorted, is essential to the record of the war, and *The World* publishes it as a notable contribution to history.

While a peculiar interest attaches to Tirpitz in the United States by reason of the fact that he was the father of ruthless submarine warfare, it is to Ludendorff's memoirs that we must look for the explanation from the German point of view of the débâcle that left an empire in ruins.



In many respects Ludendorff is the most dramatic as well as the most sinister figure of the war, for he is the very embodiment of Prussian militarism. Emerging from obscurity, he became by virtue of his military talents and his dominating personality the dictator of Germany. He was the army and he was the civil government. The Kaiser was a puppet. The Chancellor and the Foreign Minister were Ludendorff's clerks and the Reichstag was a machine for recording his will. Not since Napoleon has so much actual power been concentrated in the hands of a single man as this type-Prussian wielded in the last phase of Germany's desperate gamble for the mastery of the world.

There is plenty of the old Prussian cynicism in Ludendorff's narrative. He talks in the spirit of Frederick the Great, to whom nothing was immoral except failure, nothing criminal except lack of success. A characteristic example is Ludendorff's reference to the German intrigues with Mexico, which were exposed when the United States Government made public the Zimmermann note. The shamelessness of this plot against a country with which Germany was then at peace brings no rebuke from Ludendorff. What incenses him is the fact that "in spite of my warnings the Foreign Office had used an antiquated and easily decipherable code."

With equal frankness, Ludendorff confesses that the United States was driven into the war as a matter of General Staff policy. "With the help of our submarines," he says, "we reckoned on a decision in our favor, at the very latest, before America with her new armies could intervene in the war."

Senator Chamberlain, Senator Lodge and other timid patriots who believe that the American people are unfit to form any opinions of their own have protested against the publication of the Ludendorff memoirs on the ground that they are "propaganda." To be sure they are propa-

ganda, but not the kind of propaganda that these Senators suspect. On the whole they are the most complete vindication of the United States, its policies and its motives, that any American could desire. But were they less so, their publication would be no less a journalistic duty.

They are an essential part of the record, and the American people are quite competent to estimate them at their exact value. Nobody is going to turn back the clock of history and give the victory to Imperial Germany because of anything that Ludendorff says, although this is what Senator Chamberlain and Senator Lodge seem to fear.

The time has come to end all this direct and indirect censorship, give the American people the evidence and let them draw their own conclusions. They are not babies who must be kept forever in intellectual swaddling clothes, pap-fed on bottled opinions. There has been too much of that already. The war is over, and anybody who is now afraid of German propaganda is afraid of a ghost.

*The World* is not impressed by any of the protests that have been made against the publication of the Ludendorff memoirs. We wish only that all the secret archives of the Imperial German Government, that all the personal narratives of the men who were masters of Germany during this conflict, could be dragged forth with into light. We can conceive of no other revelations that would do so much to stabilize the world politically and write the final epitaph of imperial ambition. Whatever attempts may be made at defense or extenuation, history provides no more impressive warning.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF DISARMAMENT <sup>1</sup>

[From *The Atlantic Monthly*, August, 1921]

IN 1910 David Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Asquith Cabinet, estimated that the direct war expenditures of "the countries of the world" were at that time no less than \$2,250,000,000 a year, and were increasing at a rate that would double this sum by 1920. He then predicted that the economic life of the nations could not long endure the strain; and it did not long endure the strain. Within four years Europe was in the midst of the most disastrous war yet recorded in the annals of the human race.

By common consent Germany has been held responsible for this conflict, and this responsibility is formally acknowledged in the Treaty of Versailles. But when we say that Germany was responsible, we do not mean that Germany alone created the conditions that brought about the war, and that Germany alone shaped the issues that inspired the appeal to arms. The record of Germany's guilt is, in the main, the record of the Imperial Government in the latter part of July, 1914, after Lord Grey, then Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, had made an appeal for a four-power conference, to adjust the situation that had grown out of the assassinations at Serajevo.

Speaking recently in the House of Commons, the British Prime Minister, in referring to the origin of the war, said,—

"The more one reads the memoirs and books written in the different countries upon what happened before August 1, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was

<sup>1</sup> Copyright, 1921, by the Atlantic Monthly Co.

something towards which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly."

President Wilson was savagely censured in 1916 for a speech in which he said that he did not know just what the war was about, and had never been able to find anybody who could tell him. To his exasperated critics there was no mystery whatever about it. Europe was at war because the Germans were a wicked and depraved folk, who had taken diabolical advantage of the unsuspecting innocence of the Russians, the French, and the British. An opinion of that sort does well enough for the temporary purposes of propaganda, but it hardly serves the ends of history; and curiously enough we are still without authentic information as to the final argument that swung the Imperial Government to one of the most reckless and disastrous decisions in all history. All the German war memoirs, biographies, and recollections that have appeared since the war are strangely vague when they arrive at that fateful moment when the sword was thrown into the balance. They do not tell us precisely who was in favor of and who was opposed to war, and what the final argument was that determined the course of the Government.

Yet it is possible to piece together certain scraps of information that are available, and arrive at a fairly satisfactory conclusion. In order to sustain its enlarged military establishment, the German Government had been compelled to impose what was equivalent to a tax on capital. This tax was most burdensome to German commerce and industry under the intensive competition to which they were subjected. Not only were the Social Democrats, the most numerous party in the Empire, preparing to resist the renewal of the military estimates, but German business was increasingly restive under its load of taxation. To the Junker mind, there was no solution of the problem short of war. To diminish the

military establishment was unthinkable. To make the political concessions necessary to appease the Social Democrats and obtain their support for the army programme was likewise unthinkable. The overhead had become too great for the Imperial system. Then came the murder of the heir-apparent to the throne of Austria-Hungary, and the General Staff instantly reverted to the ancient precept of imperialism,—not merely German imperialism, but all imperialism,—which is that a successful foreign war is the best means of averting a domestic crisis. And so Europe was plunged in blood in consequence of a military panic that had its origin in an economic emergency, which in turn was produced by competitive armament. The Lloyd George prediction of 1910 was fulfilled.

When the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the speech referred to, the \$2,250,000,000 which the nations were spending every year for past and future wars represented \$50,000,000,000 of wealth, on a basis of five per cent. In other words, \$50,000,000,000 of the world's assets were for all practical purposes segregated and devoted to the task of earning income to be devoted exclusively to supporting military adventures of one kind or another.

After a war that cost approximately \$348,000,000,000 in property and production, nobody quite knows the aggregate war budget of the nations. It has been variously estimated at from eight to ten billion dollars a year. If we take the smaller figure and capitalize it at the modest rate of five per cent, the amount is \$160,000,000,000—which means that, after extinguishing \$348,000,000,000 of the world's wealth, \$160,000,000,000 of what is left is now set aside to pay the reckoning and make ready for new wars.

It is needless to say that labor and industry cannot carry that burden, and when government attempts to

sweat them to that extent, it is defeating the very ends of national defense which it professes to serve. War is no longer a conflict between uniformed forces of professional combatants. It is a conflict of all the resources of the belligerents, of whatsoever kind and nature. What ended this war was the overwhelming economic force of the United States. What enabled Germany to fight all Europe to a standstill on two fronts was, not its superior military establishment, but its superior economic system.

The German army was undoubtedly the most perfect military machine ever constructed by the genius of man, but it ditched itself within six weeks after the beginning of the war. All the elaborately contrived plans of the General Staff were frustrated at the battle of the Marne, after von Kluck had outmarched his communications. The remainder of the war was a series of desperate attempts on the part of the German high command to adjust itself to conditions that it had never contemplated; and in the end it was the economic collapse of internal Germany which left Ludendorff's armies a defenseless shell. So much for military preparedness at its best and its worst.

While military experts are acrimoniously discussing the lessons of the war, the most important lesson attracts practically no attention on their part. It is the lesson that was demonstrated in its most dramatic form by the American intervention—that is, that economic resources can be easily and quickly translated into military resources; that a sound economic system is the essential element in any extensive military undertaking. But these resources are not interchangeable. Economic energy can be speedily converted into military energy, but military energy is not reconvertible into economic energy. Like the radiated heat of the sun, it is lost. It can never be reassembled and welded into another sun.

The white man's civilization is an economic civilization. It is sustained by economic supremacy, and by that

alone. It is that which has given to the so-called Nordic races their dominion over land and sea. In point of numbers they are inferior to the brown and yellow races. In point of physical courage they are likewise inferior, for the Oriental faces both torture and death with a resignation and a fatalism that the white man either had never attained or has long ago lost. In ability to endure hardship, to exist on a minimum of nourishment, and to survive in the midst of an evil environment, the swarming millions of Asia are superior to the European or the American. As for intellectual power, dismissing the uses to which that power is applied, the Eastern mind has attained a discipline and a subtlety of reasoning that the Western mind has never yet achieved. It is the white man's economic accomplishments which have been the magic carpet that transported him everywhere, and the armor that none could penetrate. While this economic supremacy exists, no other race can challenge the white man's civilization. Whenever that supremacy has been weakened, the white man's civilization has been menaced. It is again in peril.

Three great military empires were extinguished in the war, but three great economic empires were wrecked, as well. Russia has been rightly described as an "economic vacuum." Austria-Hungary is practically in ruins; and whether the great German economic machine will ever be permitted to function freely again is still a matter of speculation. We are only beginning to comprehend the terrific impact of the blow that the war dealt to the economic structure of Europe; and from the day the Armistice was signed, conditions have grown steadily worse. It must be apparent to anybody who will examine the situation dispassionately that, unless this economic fabric can be speedily restored, modern civilization may slowly disintegrate, to its utter ruin, as preceding civilizations have disintegrated.

Obviously the place to begin the work of reconstruction, so far as the government is concerned, is with the burden of taxation under which all the great nations are groaning. The one point at which an extensive reduction of taxation can be made, which reduction will have an instantaneous economic effect, is military expenditure.

The United States is spending on future wars alone more than the entire net expenses of the Federal government five years ago. It is spending as much as the aggregate net earnings of all the railroads of the country in their most prosperous year. Nobody has yet shown wherein there is a shadow of an excuse for this exhausting strain on the nation's economic resources, or what peril or policy of government can warrant such expenditure. To say that it is done for the national defense is silly. The national defense is weakened, not strengthened, by this excessive drain.

Of all the nonsense that is talked about preparedness, no other nonsense quite touches the depths of imbecility which are reached by the prattle about nations that are "rich but defenseless." Nations that are rich are not defenseless. They contain in themselves all the elements for defense. They may have been defenseless in times when war was the exclusive business of professional soldiers, but all that has been changed. The elements of national defense are now the sum total of all the economic resources of the country plus all the man power. In time of imminent danger, the mobilization of a thousand chemists might be infinitely more important than the mobilization of a million troops.

The conventional argument that armament is a form of national insurance is one that is not highly impressive in the circumstances. Insurance does not run parallel with competitive armament, and it is with competitive armament that the world is dealing. No property-owner feels compelled to take out new policies because a business rival



has increased his insurance. Nor does he ever feel impelled to establish a two-policy or three-policy standard in respect to other property owners, or solemnly to announce as a measure of life or death that, come what may, his insurance must equal that of any of his competitors, whether he occupies a fire-proof building or not.

Moreover, if a manufacturer devoted eighty per cent of his total income, as the United States government is doing, to paying insurance premiums, his creditors would soon intervene, and his case would also receive the careful attention of an expert alienist. He might be solvent, and he might be sane, but neither his solvency nor his sanity would be taken for granted. What an individual could not do without subjecting himself to court proceeding is what every government is doing in the name of national defense.

No nation can be asked to strip itself of all defense—that is beyond the bounds of reason; but the system of competitive armament has nothing to sustain it except the incompetency of statesmanship. Most wars are made by politicians engaged in capitalizing race-prejudices and international rivalries for their own advantage. Wars that spring from the people themselves are few, indeed; and most of the money that is now spent in preparing for another war among the white races is doubly wasted. If there is such a war during the lifetime of the next generation, on a scale equal to that of the recent war, it makes no difference who triumphs or who is defeated. Victor and vanquished alike will perish in the ruins of the civilization that they have destroyed.

Spending money on competitive armament at this time, under the pretext of providing for national defense, is like drawing blood from a patient who is suffering from pernicious anæmia. The disease may not be fatal in itself, but the remedy is sure to be. Whether Europe can recover from the effects of this inconceivably disas-

trous war is still a debatable question. No person even reasonably familiar with the situation in which mankind finds itself would venture to predict the general state of civilization five years hence. The issue is still hanging in the balance.

The old Prussian doctrine of *Weltmacht oder Niedergang* has taken on aspects that were never dreamed of by Bernhardt or the General Staff. It has extended itself to all Western civilization—the *Weltmacht* that comes from continued economic development, or the *Niedergang* that must result from economic exhaustion. Collapse is inevitable if the impaired resources of the world are to be steadily depleted by the competition of armament that has been stimulated beyond the wildest dreams of ante-bellum imperialism. Unless the statesmanship of the world can be brought to a realization of the imperative necessity of economic rehabilitation and of the immediate need of sacrificing everything that stands in the way of that rehabilitation, then indeed was this war the *Götterdämmerung*—the twilight of the white man's gods.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE CONDUCT OF LIFE

MR. COBB was not wholly immersed in politics, great as were the political crises that broke in his time. He was a keen critic in music, in art, in literature; had wide acquaintance among artists and liked occasionally to turn aside from the main current of events to treat of topics whose interest may be more enduring but was less tense at the moment. The articles that follow range from ships and shoes and sealing wax to cabbages and kings.

#### [THE PLAYS OF BERNARD SHAW]

[October 15, 1905]

"It's clever, but is it Art?" whispered the Devil in Mr. Kipling's "Conundrums of the Workshop."

New York is asking substantially the same question about Mr. Bernard Shaw's plays. They are clever—even a New York audience can perceive that obtrusive fact—but are they art? The consensus of opinion seems to be that if they are they ought not to be.

New York's interest in Mr. Shaw is recent. Although it has been a decade since Richard Mansfield added "Arms and the Man" to his repertoire, it has been hardly two years since New York began to concern itself seriously with the most picturesque writer of the contemporary English playmakers.

Not being one of the six best-selling novels, Mr. Shaw did not quicken the fervor of the American manager or arouse the enthusiasm of the play-going public. But he has had his revenge for years of neglect. The dramas of Mr. Shaw are now advertised on bill-boards in the Jersey marshes.

A Shaw play is sure of an audience, even though the impulse be no higher than the Athenian curiosity which prompts the public to spend its money to find what the play is all about. New York is adding materially to that modest bank account which "Arms and the Man" enabled Mr. Shaw to open and by means of which he became "comparatively conservative in my political opinions."

It must have been at least fifteen years ago that Mr. Shaw, who was a Socialist and a vegetarian and an Ibsenite and presumably an anti-vivisectionist and various other bizarre things, started out to create a "new drama" for the people that speak the English speech. The recipe was very simple indeed. Shakespeare had made history a concrete thing to the masses. Why not take up the question that moderns call the political, economic and social problems of the day and exploit them on the stage in concrete form too? In other words, Mr. Shaw seems to have asked himself why he should not dramatize the essays and editorials and novels he had been writing, in the hope of making a more convincing appeal to a larger audience.

There is nothing particularly revolutionary about this, or even shocking or astounding or extraordinary. A long line of dramatists, from Aristophanes to Ibsen, had done the same thing, and all that Mr. Shaw undertook to do was to apply the recipe to the English stage. Yet he has derived from it an amount of notoriety which threatens to make him famous.

Seemingly, what astounds his critics is more his choice of subjects than his treatment of them. Instead of ex-

ploiting the familiar domestic triangle of the modern French dramatist or the Gibson-girl product of the American playsmith or the Pinero lady who tries to live down a dubious past, Mr. Shaw resolved to stage political economy and tenement-house reform and the social evil and various other subjects usually treated in an academic way. And he woke up to find himself regarded as immoral because he was unusual.

Seeing that Ibsen did not appeal to English theatre-goers, Mr. Shaw believed that he could translate Ibsen into Shaw, and make them understand Shaw. Convinced that Richard Wagner had woven his own political theories into his operas and that the "Ring of the Nibelungs" was a sort of musical version of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* Mr. Shaw set out to do the same thing for himself.

Now, if he had gone to Hyde Park on a Sunday afternoon, stood on a stool and harangued the crowd about slum landlordism and municipal jobbery, he would have attracted no more attention than do any of the other cranks who make similar speeches every week. Mr. Shaw knew this; so he put his thoughts about the respectability that fattens off the slums in the form of a play and called it "Widowers' Houses." Thereupon he became the subject of an animated and acrimonious discussion and obtained the publicity for his ideas which he was seeking.

Similarly Mr. Shaw takes a chapter from Schopenhauer, dramatizes it, calls it "Man and Superman" and sets the two greatest cities of the world to arguing about the morality of it all. Or he puts his somewhat incoherent and eccentric opinions about the Irish question into the form of a play, calls it "John Bull's Other Island" and leaves the critics to demonstrate by exhaustive arguments that he does not understand Irish politics.

In the meantime, however, he has presented his opinions to the public in a manner that has gained them the

maximum of attention, and he can proceed leisurely to new fields of proselyting. To the charge that these are not proper subjects for dramatic exploitation Mr. Shaw sanely replies in effect that he is exploiting them that way, and is not in the least concerned as to whether they be proper subjects or not.

He might have said in the form of essay everything that he has said in his plays, and not a solitary critic would have lost a minute's sleep about the goodness or badness of it. A few good-natured reviewers would probably have commended Mr. Shaw patronizingly for his Whistlerian style, and that would have ended the essays. Or, Mr. Shaw might have written formal dissertations on Political Economy and Socialism, had them printed in two volumes and left them to accumulate dust on the shelves of Carnegie libraries. Or he might have put his theories about the marriage relation into the form of a medical treatise, and the profession would have accepted it as a commonplace statement of unquestioned scientific facts, while the public would have ignored it.

But Mr. Shaw presumed to lay impious hands upon a moribund stage, and thereby disturbed all the brood who fear that if the stage is brought into too intimate relations with human life it will make neighborhood talk.

If Mr. Shaw were an American he would probably be making plays about Charles F. Murphy, or the Federal regulation of railway rates, or the Tenderloin, or life-insurance finance, or the servant-girl problem in the suburbs, or municipal ownership of public utilities, or Mr. Roosevelt. They would probably require thought on the part of the audience—a thing abhorrent to the American school of dramatists. They would be better understood on the east side than on Fifth Avenue, which would be accepted as damning evidences both of sedition and vulgarity. He would probably indulge in paradoxes to stimulate interest, and would seek advertising by the rather

meretricious method of shocking conventional prudery and would play pranks with respectability; but at least he would have something to say and would say it like an artist.

One need not take too seriously Mr. Shaw's affectations and studied eccentricities and incorrigible weakness for paradox. Talent has various ways of bringing itself to public notice. Disraeli affected gaudy waistcoats and Shaw affects gaudy paradoxes. Both served the same purpose and bore little relation to the real thing underneath.

This is not to say that the Shaw plays are models of dramatic construction, or that the Shaw social order is anything more than topsy-turvy-dom, or that the Shaw political economy would bear too cold an analysis. The material fact is that Mr. Shaw has real or pretended convictions and has the audacity to dramatize them. This in itself is theatrical heresy, particularly in the United States.

To conceive the extent of the Shaw offending it would be necessary only to try to imagine Mr. Clyde Fitch or Mr. Augustus Thomas with serious convictions about public questions which they dramatized and presented to the public through the vehicle of the stage. All Broadway would shriek with laughter at the joke.

But, after all, is there anything particularly absurd about the basic principle of Mr. Shaw's work? Playwrights are fond of chattering about the stage as a great vehicle for the moral and intellectual education of the masses. If it really is a medium of education, is there any reason why it should not concern itself with vital things of everyday life that men are talking about in the shops and the factories and the streets and the saloons?

Is there anything more absurd about dramatizing trades-unionism, for example, than about dramatizing a *mariage de convenance*? As for the realism that Shaw's critics complain of, that too is largely a superstition of

prudery. There is realism and realism, and the Ibsen-Shaw realism differs as widely from the Zola realism as the operating-room in a public hospital differs from a Raines Law hotel.

ROBERT E. LEE

[January 20, 1907]

WHAT would have been the course of American events since 1861 if Robert Edward Lee, the one-hundredth anniversary of whose birth was celebrated yesterday, could have seen his way clear to accept command of the Federal Army which Lincoln virtually offered to him through Francis P. Blair? There is little profit in crying over the spilled milk of history, yet a correct estimate of Gen. Lee's abilities, achievements and influence cannot be made without considering this question.

That Lee became Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate armies, to conduct the most masterful defensive campaigns in modern warfare, was little more than an accident, plus the incapacity of the Buchanan Administration. Lee had no sympathy with the South Carolina and Mississippi fire-eaters. He opposed secession. Like Stonewall Jackson he believed the Southern States should stay in the Union and battle there for their constitutional rights. He was not a supporter of slavery, and would have welcomed any form of emancipation that promised an amicable settlement of the differences between the two sections.

When Lee resigned from the United States Army he had no intention of taking up arms in the Southern cause. In January, 1861, he had written: "If the Union is dissolved and the Government is disrupted, I shall return to my native State and share the miseries of my



people, and, save in defense, will draw my sword on none." Even when Blair made the tentative offer of command at the instance of Lincoln, Lee was still in doubt. He could not see his way clear to fight against his own people, and at the same time he had no desire to fight against the North. Virginia had not yet adopted the ordinance of secession, and the opposition to such an ordinance was still strong. The Richmond *Whig* said, "An ordinance of secession in February would have met a prompt rejection at the polls." In the convention in April, 55 of the 143 delegates voted against secession, and even as late as the night previous to the adoption of the ordinance John Tyler, who ardently supported it, doubted whether it could have passed. In May when it was submitted to the people for ratification the popular vote was only 96,750 to 32,134 showing the strength of the Union sentiment that still existed in spite of popular passion worked up by political manipulators.

It was not until three days after the ordinance of secession had been adopted by the convention that Lee resigned from the United States Army. He was then urged by the Governor to take command of the Virginia forces, and accepted reluctantly as a duty which he owed the people of his State.

Had a strong and tactful President sat in Buchanan's chair during the critical period preceding Lincoln's inauguration, it is more than probable that he could have fostered a union sentiment which would have kept Virginia from seceding, even if the State had undertaken to maintain the pretense of a Kentucky neutrality. In that event Lee would either have accepted the command of the Federal Army or he would have retired to his estate. He was already fifty-four when the war began and had earned the right to retire in favor of his juniors. In either case he would not have become Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate Army; the war would not have

been prolonged for four years by his brilliant strategy while the North was educating successful generals, and historians would have a vastly different story to write of a lost cause and the subsequent blunders of reconstruction.

Lincoln and Lee are the two great figures of the civil conflict concerning whom today there is the least difference of opinion North or South. But if the North is now generous in paying tribute to Lee's character and genius, it must be said that it has never been ungenerous. Grant testifies in his memoirs that "it was not an uncommon thing for my staff officers to hear from Eastern officers, 'Well, Grant has never met Bobby Lee yet,' " and he remarks, with perhaps some little feeling of resentment, that Lee's "praise was sounded throughout the entire North after every action in which he was engaged." If there has been any change of Northern sentiment in the last forty years toward Robert E. Lee, it is to regard him less and less as the defeated Commander-in-Chief of a rebel army and more and more as one of the great military figures—perhaps the greatest military figure—of American history.

ED HOWE

[January 2, 1911]

HIS full name is Edgar Watson Howe, but he is more commonly known as Ed Howe, and sometimes they call him Old Ed Howe, although he is only fifty-six. For thirty-three years he has edited the *Daily Globe* out in Atchison, Kan., and now he is rich enough to quit work and loaf with his soul.

According to New York standards, Atchison is not much of a town. Broadway would be bored to death there in fifteen minutes; but Ed Howe put Atchison on

the map and has kept it there year in and year out. He is the spoiled child of Kansas, for the people there have allowed him to remain sane, presumably in the belief that this eccentricity of genius advertised the State. To show the extent to which this coddling has been carried, they even permitted him to discuss the Ossawatimie speech rationally and intelligently.

Out in Kansas they are mighty fond of Ed Howe, in spite of his incorrigible mental maturity, and the readers of every American newspaper with a competent exchange editor know about the *Atchison Globe*. *The World* reprints some of the *Globe* paragraphs on its editorial page almost every day. But Ed Howe has literary claims too, entirely apart from the hard day-labor of newspaper-making. He wrote a story once entitled "The Story of a Country Town," and if the rewards of literature bore any relation to merit, a million copies of it would have been sold.

We are glad Ed Howe is rich enough to quit work, but we hope he makes enough bad investments so that he will have to turn out an editorial or a paragraph from time to time, for we shall miss him dreadfully.

R. I. P.

[March 23, 1911]

THE sport of kings in New York is dead by its own hand, killed by its own arrogance. Had the men in control kept to the traditions of the noble game, racing their thoroughbreds to see which was the better horse, backing their judgment if they willed but keeping the professional betting-ring a sordid incident to gallant sport, none but fanatics would have attacked them. But when they allowed their splendid thoroughbreds to become mere

markers to be pawed by gamblers, when they became business partners of the bookmaker, when they deliberately built the whole structure of their support upon his profits and their rake-off, when they took sides in the greedy quarrels between bookmakers and pool-rooms, they were ringing the knell of a sport which they had degraded into a dissipation.

Even when their decadence had brought hostile legislation upon them, horse-racing in the State might still have been saved. But then their stupid law arrogance stepped in. They tried to ridicule the law with golf-ball suits. Some of them at least we believe to have set out to debauch the legislation of the State with corruption funds. And the consequence is that they have drawn down upon themselves the present law, so drastic that it makes them criminally responsible for any bet made within the confines of their race-courses and drives racing from the State.

The fault is theirs, the penalty is the public's. The owner merely ships his stable to Europe or runs his string in other States. The gambler merely substitutes the pool-room for the betting-ring or the stock-ticker for both. But for the thousands of genuine lovers of the race-horse there is no substitute. They can only feel that they would never have been deprived of their legitimate pleasure if there had been less talk about improving the breed of the American race-horses and more attention to improving the breed of American horse-racers.

### THE ANNEXATION BOGY

[August 4, 1911]

AT the outset of the Canadian campaign the foes of Reciprocity in the Dominion are busily restuffing with straw the bogy of annexation.

They rely upon the attempts of the Northwestern granger papers to frighten Canadian voters and defeat Reciprocity; upon sensational quotations from other papers which have used annexation as a text for buncombe about "manifest destiny"; and upon one exuberant, ill-considered oratorical outburst of Speaker Champ Clark.

No American statesman of commanding rank has countenanced this folly. President Taft deplores and disowns it. Mr. Underwood, the Democratic House leader, and Senator Martin, the Democratic leader in the upper house, have lent themselves to no such spread-eagleism. The press in general has treated the issue with candor and common sense.

So long as slavery lasted, annexation was an issue in American politics. Desiring more slave territory, Southern politicians planned raids on Cuba; they viewed with sympathy Walker's attempt to force slavery upon Nicaragua; they backed that abomination to Northern free-soilers, the war with Mexico. But to forestall the free-State men from casting longing eyes upon Canada in reprisal, the Southerners supported Canadian Reciprocity in 1854.

They reasoned—and keener politicians were never schooled—that the best way to spike the guns of Canadian annexationists was to ease the fret of the boundary upon trade. That is as true today as it was fifty-seven years ago. To take the boundary out of politics, lower or tear down the tariff walls and let trade be no longer reminded of it by senseless daily exactions.

Never since our Civil War has Canadian annexation been more than an academic question. Complete the Reciprocity arrangement and buncombe oratory and protected trusts will give up the futile attempt to make of it an issue.

## THE LOS ANGELES MURDER TRIAL

[October 8, 1911]

THE trial of John J. and James B. McNamara, set for Wednesday next in Los Angeles, Cal., bids fair to be one of the most important in American history, in its bearing and effect upon social and industrial conditions. It will be followed with interest from one end of the country to the other.

The crime of which these men are accused was a hideous one. Twenty-one men, each the head of a family, were killed on the night of Oct. 1, 1910, in the building of the Los Angeles *Times*—by a purposed explosion of dynamite, as the prosecution will seek to show; by a gas explosion, as the defense is expected to claim. Backward and forward from this appalling calamity runs a six-years-long story of similar outrages, following the general strike declared on Aug. 10, 1905, against the American Bridge Company. The National Erectors' Association has compiled a list of ninety dynamite explosions or attempts, eighteen criminal assaults, one arson and four cases of tampering with machinery, all of which, it is claimed, have grown out of the strike against structural-steel contractors.

For every one of these outrages described the International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers—the McNamara body—has an explanation not involving union criminality. Either the alleged outrage is pure invention; or private venegance was being wreaked; or there was gross carelessness of "scab" workers; or—most often—the employers had "planted" dynamite to discredit organized labor. If the latter be the true explanation, "planted" explosions involving the destruction of much valuable property and the loss of

many lives seem a cruel and costly method of seeking the support of public opinion.

If the claim of a gas explosion fails in the Los Angeles case, the "plant" theory will be used by the defense to explain the dynamite and the clocks said to have been found in valises, in barns, and even stored in the basement of the Indianapolis business building where the union had its offices.

Counsel as able as any in the country will undertake this defense; a vast fund has been contributed for the purpose by members of labor unions; and zeal which could not be purchased at any price will be put at the service of the accused by counsel in sympathy with them.

In a statement for *The World* elsewhere printed to-day, Detective Byrnes, who collected evidence for the prosecution, says that the real defense of the McNamaras is that a state of war existed between labor and capital; in which deeds of violence were acts of war. Not in a court-room can such a defense be heard. There but one question is to be considered: Were these two men implicated in the deliberate murder of twenty-one working-men?

If they were, no crime more richly deserving death has ever been committed. If they were not, the sooner their exoneration comes the better for them and for the Structural Iron Workers. They should be eager for the verdict.

## OUR TREATIES WITH RUSSIA

[December 20, 1911]

THE abrogation of the Russian Treaty of 1832 in a manner approved by diplomatic courtesy will leave the two countries still bound to each other by many ties of friendly agreement.

Our northwestern-boundary cry of "54-40 or fight!" arose out of an agreement with Russia in 1824 as to trade and trading-posts on the Pacific coast. The Russian Treaty of 1867 negotiated by Seward is our sole title to Alaska. The Treaty of 1832 itself was modified by another Treaty in 1868. As early as 1854 we agreed with Russia by treaty that "free ships make free goods." The declaration of 1874 clarified somewhat the mutual usage in Russia and the United States as to trade-marks hitherto covered by the 1868 addition to the Treaty of 1832. The agreement of 1884 defined the system of measurement of vessels of the two nations for tonnage dues and other purposes.

The extradition convention of 1887 has for twenty-four years bound Russia and the United States to return fugitive criminals, except political offenders, to each other. The agreement of 1894 provided a *modus vivendi* in the prolonged fur-seal-fishery agitation. The protocol of 1900 is no longer applicable; it merely named Mr. Asser of the Netherlands, the most recent recipient of the Nobel prize, for his services to peace, as arbitrator of certain claims against Russia for the illegal seizure of sealing-vessels. In 1904 a Treaty regulating the position of corporations was formally ratified by the two countries, and in 1906 an agreement for the protection of trademarks in China was effected by an exchange of diplomatic notes.

The United States and Russia are also bound as members of the concert of nations by a series of international conferences, among which Americans may mention with pardonable pride those at The Hague for arbitration and the mitigation of war, in which great cause the Czar has led the monarchs of the world as the United States has led the nations.

The United States and Russia need to redraft only one of a considerable number of agreements binding them in friendly intercourse. The need is mutual. The



Treaty of 1832, in the language of the Lodge resolution, is "no longer responsive" to the conditions in either country. A Treaty nearly eighty years old does not conform to present-day facts and conditions. It needs revision.

### PERVERTED SYMPATHY<sup>1</sup>

[April 11, 1914]

WRITING to *The World* in behalf of the condemned "gunmen," Mrs. Inez Milholland-Boissevain asserts that—

Life, education and environment have penalized these youths to the fullest extent, as evidenced by their every word and act.

With due respect to Mrs. Boissevain, this is sheer nonsense. These young men were penalized by themselves, and by themselves alone.

They came of decent, hard-working parents. They were born under exactly the same conditions that tens of thousands of industrious, law-abiding men in New York were born. They had the same educational opportunities. They had the same chance to make something of themselves. They did not become criminals by circumstance. They are not "warped and misshapen offspring of our present social conditions," as Mrs. Boissevain calls them. They elected a criminal career as the easiest way of making a living. Society did not lead them to the shadow of the death-chair. They blazed their own trail.

Mrs. Boissevain does not believe in capital punishment. That is a debatable question. But the death sentence over these "gunmen" is no more an argument against capital

<sup>1</sup> Printed at the request of a New York man who was an office boy in 1911 and on whom this article made a deep impression.

punishment than is the death sentence over Schmidt. Nor are their cases the kind over which Mrs. Boissevain need waste "sympathy and everlasting pity."

If any part of society is to blame for the fate of the "gunmen," however, it is the philanthropic and uplifting element with which Mrs. Boissevain is identified. For years various writers, lecturers, agitators and social workers in this community have been preaching a gospel that is a gospel of disaster.

They have been teaching in effect that society owes everybody a living; that work is bondage; that workers are wage-slavers; that all employers are oppressors; that civilization is a tyrant which grinds out the lives of the poor to create luxuries for the rich, and that nobody is responsible for anything he may do unless he happens to have been born with a silver spoon in his mouth.

What wonder that our Whitey Lewises, our Dago Franks, our Gyps the Blood and our Lefty Louies drink in this contempt for honest labor, and for fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters who are content to earn their bread in the sweat of their faces! Why work when one can be a thug, a tin-horn gambler, a pimp, a cheap burglar and a criminal parasite upon society in general? That sort of doctrine is pounded into the ears of the youth of New York every day. Fortunately, most of them have too much sense and character to follow it. But that is not the fault of the social agitators who spare no effort to teach the degradation of labor.

Society owes neither reparation nor apology to the graduates of this school. Whatever sympathy *The World* has to give, whatever help it can offer, will not be wasted upon "gunmen" convicted of murder. Whatever measure of sympathy and help *The World* can extend to struggling humanity is reserved for the boys and girls, the men and women, who are seeking to make something of themselves, who are striving to be useful members of

society, who are not afraid to do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and who try to do their duty as God gives them strength and light to see that duty. These are the people whose battle *The World* esteems it a high privilege to help fight, and we shall waste none of our time in blubbering over convicted "gunmen," the manner of whose death will be no more shameful than the manner of their life.

## WOMAN'S RIGHT TO VOTE

[March 14, 1915]

WHETHER the Equal Suffrage Amendment to the Constitution of New York is ratified by the voters of the States next fall will depend upon the attitude of women themselves.

If the majority of women earnestly desire the suffrage for themselves and their sex, the amendment will probably be adopted. On this question men voters are sure to be mightily swayed by the opinions of the women members of the family. If the majority of women are antagonistic or indifferent, the amendment will be defeated.

*The World* has made an effort to arrive at the sentiment, in a general way, of women themselves toward the suffrage. The results may be summarized in this fashion:

1. Among women who express an opinion either way, a very large majority desire the vote.
2. Most of the women to whom opportunity was given to express their sentiments had no opinion either for or against suffrage, and are presumably not yet interested in the issue.

The neutral attitude of the women who are without opinion does not affect the merits of the question, but if they maintain this attitude it will seriously affect the results at the polls.

As to the issue itself, *The World* is frank to admit that it knows of no valid arguments against woman suffrage which do not apply with equal force against manhood suffrage. Government is merely the expression of the political purposes of the community. The community is made up of men and women, all of whom have an equal right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. No adult woman of sound mind is subjected to a guardianship in any of the affairs of life except politics. She may buy and sell, she may sue and be sued, she may own property and convey property—she may do anything that a man may do except vote. In other words, she may do everything except exercise a direct power upon the political institutions to which she is subject. This is a negation of democracy.

From the day of the Magna Charta down to the day of the New Freedom the genius of republican institutions has steadily sought to broaden the base of the electoral power—to make these institutions more democratic. Originally, only the King had the vote. Then the barons seized the franchise and the vote. What the barons won all landholders eventually acquired. The States of the United States finally swept away property qualifications and established manhood suffrage. The Negro was enfranchised, and now comes woman, the last remaining element in the body politic, to demand that a right which can not be denied to citizens of the United States on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude shall not be denied on account of sex.

The argument that government is based upon force and that women should not be allowed to vote because they are deficient in physical prowess hardly deserves to be taken seriously. Governments hire their force as they hire all their other service. Even when they resort to conscription they pick and choose—and pay. No country in modern times ever did or ever could muster its entire

male population into its military establishment. Probably half of the entire German Army today is engaged in duties that are practically civilian. All of war is not fighting in the trenches or goose-stepping to the front. The French women who gather the harvests and the German women who plough the fields perform a military service no less important than that of the men on the firing-line. Without their efforts in providing food the men could not continue the war.

Most of the conventional arguments against woman suffrage are fantastic, but not less so than most of the popular arguments in favor of woman suffrage. All pretense that votes for women will "purify politics" may be dismissed as "clotted nonsense," to use Carlyle's favorite objurgation. Women will not purify politics. They never have done so in States in which they have the vote, and they never will. As a sex, women average no better than men. They are no more honest. They are no more disinterested. They are no more patriotic. Their public ideals are no higher, but rather lower, if anything. As a class they are less wise in general affairs than men because their experience is less wide. The classes that already vote necessarily have a clearer understanding of the functions and limitations of government than the classes that are seeking the vote.

Women suffrage will not reform government in the conventional moral sense, although in the long run it will produce a more representative and responsible government. If we may judge the future by the past, the immediate effect of woman suffrage will be to disorganize government and add to its confusion. That is what has always happened when the franchise was extended. Each new influx of voters submerged the old order, and the former standards of public service deteriorated for the time being, much to the anguish of the Brahmin classes, but not to the permanent injury of society. Enlarging the

suffrage 'does not purify government, but enlarging the suffrage stabilizes and strengthens democracy, and hence the ultimate influence is invariably for the general good. In a democracy the people do not exist for the Government, but the Government exists for the people, and every adult person subject to government may reasonably ask for a voice in ordering the policies of that Government.

For women to demand suffrage on the ground that they are purer and nobler and holier than men is to argue against their own cause. An oligarchy of virtue would be only one degree less oppressive than an oligarchy of vice. Nobody has ever obtained the franchise on the mere pretext that he was pure in heart, and nobody ever will. The franchise is not granted in order that politics may be purified, but in order that the holder of the franchise may the better protect his life, liberty, property and welfare under the Government to which he is responsible as a citizen.

Votes for women will not improve the quality of government, but it will make women more intelligent and more responsible, and hence society as a whole must inevitably benefit. The ballot box is a mighty university. It has proved so in the case of men and it must prove so in the case of women, or the experience of history is false.

Moreover, the political influence already exerted by a few women makes it highly desirable that all women be enfranchised in order to re-establish the balance. Under republican institutions power without responsibility is a grave evil. Women today have great power in government, but no responsibility. Various organizations of women, which probably do not represent 10 per cent of the sex, maintain at times a veritable reign of terror in legislative bodies by pretending to speak in the name of all women. In consequence, half the country is now bedevilled by some form or another of harem government

which in no respect is a true expression of public opinion. Legislators who are no better than they ought to be are forever making ridiculous concessions to women agitators on the theory that official sympathy with such moral yearnings is a shrewd method of diverting public suspicion. The statute books are loaded down with foolish laws dictated by a few crusading women and enacted in a spirit of "The ladies—God bless them!" An overwhelming majority of women have had no voice in this legislation, and they disclaim all responsibility for its results. But the statutes remain, the situation grows worse from year to year, and all laws fall more or less into contempt through this legislation bred of fanaticism and hypocrisy.

We know what would probably happen if government were in the hands of women, and Anthony Comstock, Charles Edward Russell and the Anti-Saloon League were accepted as the spokesmen for all the disfranchised males. Yet something of that sort is going on all the time in State capitols in the name of women. The only antidote to the influence of some women upon government is the influence of all women upon government. When all sex limitations upon suffrage have been removed the political power of those women who are obsessed with the idea that government must assume the spiritual characteristics of a communistic prayer meeting will be restricted to their own votes and the voters of those who are actually in sympathy with them.

But if the claim that votes for women will purify politics is sentimental nonsense, the counter-claim that votes for women will wreck the home is equally absurd. Protecting the home is one of the favorite recreations of American Bourbonism. The home is the oldest of human institutions. It is older than government. It protects itself. It is not government that maintains the home, but it is the home that maintains government. It was because of homes that governments were established. An insti-

tution that has withstood the vicissitudes of centuries is not likely to collapse because the women of a community spend half an hour in a voting booth on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. If the home could survive St. Paul, it can survive the ballot.

Eliminating from the suffrage controversy all of its cant and twaddle, the question is a straight issue of whether all the adult citizens of the state shall be entitled to a vote in making the laws to which all of them are subject, or whether this privilege shall be the exclusive property of half of these citizens who gain their political power by the accident of sex.

Lincoln once said that this Republic was founded on the rule of "root, hog, or die," and women are no less amenable to that principle than are men. The amiable theory that it is man's function to provide and woman's function to be sheltered is a living lie, as millions of women wage-earners can testify. Sometimes man provides and sometimes he doesn't. The woman who is sheltered today may be working in a factory tomorrow to support herself and her children. Hunger knows no sex. Want knows no sex. Necessity knows no sex. Law knows no sex. Property knows no sex. Only the ballot box knows sex.

But the ballot box once knew rank. It once knew land and primogeniture. It once knew income and money and family. All those paraphernalia of privilege have been swept away, and the disability of sex will follow. In the steady sweep of democracy the time will come when the present opposition to woman suffrage will seem as short sighted and senseless as the former opposition to manhood suffrage now seems.

Democracies always move forward. That is their law of self-preservation. If they stand still or retrograde they are lost.



## APPOMATTOX FIFTY YEARS AFTER

[April 9, 1915]

THE fiftieth anniversary of Appomattox finds the United States again with a Southern-born President.

The present Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court was a private soldier in the Confederate Army, and sitting beside him on the bench is an Associate Justice who was a Captain in the Union Army.

The Secretary of the Navy and the Postmaster General are from States that seceded in 1861. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Speaker of the House of Representatives were born in slave States. The majority leader of the House is from the South, and the man who has just relinquished the majority leadership to enter the Senate is from a State among the first to leave the Union.

Never did the wounds of a great civil war heal so rapidly as did the wounds of the American conflict, and never did such terrible wounds leave so few scars. The memory of Abraham Lincoln is cherished today in the South no less than in the North. Everywhere throughout the country Robert E. Lee is recognized as the ideal of soldier-chivalry, without fear and without reproach. Everywhere Ulysses S. Grant is regarded as the embodiment of democracy in war.

It is possible that Lord Bryce was right when he said that a higher statesmanship might have averted the Civil War; but the reunited country that followed so closely upon the death and devastation of this great conflict was the supreme expression of the political wisdom of the American people. When the South accepted the result, the hand of the North was stayed. Vast armies were immediately reabsorbed into the civil life of the country. The sound political instincts of the people rejected the

radical proposals to "make treason odious" by sending to prison or to the gallows men who had participated in the rebellion. Organized bloodshed ended with the war itself, and the radicalism that purposed to follow war with a reign of terror was cheated of its prey.

Appomattox decided slavery and secession; but it decided more. It decided, in the words of Lincoln, "that among freemen there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet." That is the immortal lesson of the Civil War. Upon that principle rests the whole structure of democracy and free institutions—upon it rests the Republic.

### A CONTEMPTIBLE LEGISLATURE

[April 10, 1915]

OWNERS of canneries find it more profitable to work their women and children employees seventy-two hours a week; so the New York Legislature graciously grants the needed permission.

In the Assembly the bill is steered by a member named Bewley who is in the canning business. In the Senate, Bewley's bill is steered by a man named Spring who is at the head of two canneries. A majority of both Houses of the State Legislature has no compunction of conscience about helping these men legislate for their own pockets.

Certain property interests in New York City are hostile to the Tenement-House Department, under which slums have been eliminated and tenement-house dwellers provided with light and air. No other one thing has done more to decrease the death-rate in this city than the intelligent enforcement of the Tenement-House law by this department. So the Legislature undertakes to wreck

this department for the benefit of private greed in spite of all the efforts of the Mayor and the City Administration.

Other property interests in the State are dissatisfied with the activities of the State Health Department in the preservation of human life, and the Assembly promptly passes bills to curtail the powers of the department.

Many New York Legislatures have stubbornly resisted the enactment of progressive legislation, but this is the first time in the memory of living men that a New York Legislature has deliberately proceeded to rip those codes of progressive legislation out of the statute books at the instigation of private interests. This wretched work is done by men upon whom rest no charges of bribery and corruption. What they are doing they are doing in the name of political reaction, but money never succeeded in buying in Albany during any single session so much harm to the public welfare as reaction has obtained as a gift. The most corrupt Legislature that the State has had in a generation was less inimical to the common good than this Legislature steeped in Bourbonism and consecrated to the almighty dollar.

It is a sorry thing to say, but it is the truth. What is worse, the conduct of this Legislature is thoroughly in harmony with the new spirit of the Republican party. Albany is carrying into effect the Root-Penrose-Cannon political theory that Government must be the servant of business. A whole fabric of humanitarian legislation is torn and mangled in order to promote private profits at the expense of public progress, and Gov. Whitman sits silent.

There have been many sad exhibitions of misgovernment at Albany, but nothing else so contemptible as the exhibition made by an Administration and a Legislation that were chosen as a rebuke to Tammany Hall.

## A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

[January 19, 1916]

A RESOLUTION for immediate intervention in Mexico was introduced by Senator Lippitt of Rhode Island yesterday, and in the course of the debate the Senator said that "if I had been President, twenty-four hours would not have elapsed before the army would have been in pursuit of those murderers, and I would not have ceased until American ranchers were as safe in Mexico as on the streets of Washington."

It is one of the mercies of God bestowed upon a careless and undeserving people that Presidents of the United States are not made out of Lippitts. But the speech of the Senator from Rhode Island is a fair example of the blatherskite oratory which has become common in both Houses of Congress. We learn from the Congressional Directory that that Senator Lippitt "was a Colonel on the staff of Royal C. Taft, Governor of Rhode Island in 1888-9." Nobody else is ever so profoundly and authoritatively and aggressively military as an American politician who has been a Colonel on a Governor's staff, which explains Senator Lippitt's confidence in what he would have done "if I had been President" in the matter of Mexico.

For ourselves, we are no more anxious to have American soldiers murdered in Mexico than to have American ranchers murdered there, especially in view of the fact that the ranchers can keep out but the soldiers must go if ordered. Before Senator Lippitt and his fellow-orators in Congress undertake to force intervention they would better give the United States an army that is large enough to undertake intervention. It has no such army at the present time. If the Carranza Government

should break down in its effort to establish order and this country should be compelled by circumstances to intervene, it would not be prepared for its task. We should be sending our regular forces to be slaughtered by Mexican bandits and guerrillas because we could not send troops in sufficient numbers to make a swift and sure job of it. The General Staff has estimated that from 200,000 to 270,000 men would be required, and while many Congressmen are frothing at the mouth in their demands for instant intervention, none of them is lifting a finger to pass the administrator's army and navy bills.

Attacking the President is a task that requires no particular intelligence or responsibility. Anybody can do it who can talk and make gestures. But if the President did his work as badly as Congress is doing its work, we should be at war with half the world without the men or means or measures to carry on a war even against Mexico.

## THE LAW OF THE LAND

[May 3, 1921]

IF the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Newberry case is to stand as the final interpretation of the powers of Congress in the election of Senators and Representatives, there can be no effective Federal Corrupt-Practices Law.

The Court has held that the provision of the Constitution that Congress may regulate "the times, manner and place of holding elections for Senators and Representatives" does not apply to the regulation of the primary. "We cannot conclude," runs the majority opinion, that "the authority to control party primaries or conventions was bestowed by the grant of power to regulate the manner of holding elections."

Yet in almost half of the States of the Union a nomination at the primary, in so far as Senatorships are concerned, is equivalent to an election. What takes place on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November is only a formal ratification of the decision at the primary. If Congress cannot regulate the primary, if it cannot limit the amount of money that is to be spent or the manner in which this money is spent, it has no control whatever over the election and its constitutional authority is nullified at the outset.

At the time the Constitution was adopted there was no provision in the American political system for the nomination of candidates. Political parties did not exist and there was no constitutional recognition of the necessity for their existence. The need of nominating machinery soon became evident and the Congressional and legislative caucuses were improvised. Later, when public sentiment was aroused by the abuses growing out of this method of selecting candidates, the nominating convention was devised. When that in turn fell into the hands of the political bosses and the political machines the primary was adopted and the nominations, like the elections, were left to a plebiscite.

So far as nominations for Senator and Representative are concerned, the Supreme Court has turned the hands of the clock back to 1789. It recognizes no authority on the part of Congress to regulate these elections at the source, and if they are not regulated at the source there can be no regulation that is worth while. Even the Chief Justice, who will never be suspected of radicalism, is gravely disquieted by the ramifications of the majority opinion.

In dealing with the Volstead Prohibition Enforcement Law the Court read the word "concurrent" out of the Constitution. In dealing with a recent question of free speech it upheld the authority of Congress to empower

the Postmaster-General to exclude permanently and arbitrarily from the second-class privileges any publication whose political and economic doctrines he regarded as inimical to the present order of government. In dealing with the issue of money in politics and the systematic debauching of a Senatorial primary the Court finds that Congress exceeded its constitutional power when it undertook to limit a candidate's expenditures.

The Court's decision nullifying the Corrupt-Practices Act comes as an act of judicial intervention in the most far-reaching case of political corruption that the United States has known. The admitted expenditures to bring about Newberry's nomination aggregated \$178,000 and it has been charged many times that the total was nearer \$700,000. Newberry's nomination and election by the unstinted use of money gave the Republicans the vote in the Senate which enabled them to reorganize the committees.

For two years Mr. Newberry was the Republican majority in the Senate. Had it not been for him Henry Cabot Lodge would not have been Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Committee could not have been stacked in advance to make an adverse report on the Treaty of Versailles. The Treaty could not have been loaded down with reservations which were intended to destroy it. The partisan conspiracy to defeat the Treaty and the Covenant could not have been successfully carried through, and the United States today would not be engaged in the pitiful performance of making a separate peace with Germany by a resolution of Congress.

All this came about through the shameful use of money in a Michigan Senatorial primary, a use which the lower court and the trial jury branded as criminal but which the Supreme Court says that Congress had no power to prohibit.

And so the Newberry chapter ends. With it ends the

attempt of Congress to give the United States the beginnings of a Corrupt-Practices law that would maintain the integrity of the election of Senators and Representatives. The Constitution of the United States definitely prohibits the manufacture of a glass of beer for beverage purposes, but it does not prohibit a millionaire from buying a seat in the Senate if his money operates through a primary election. This is the law of the land.

## OKLAHOMA'S CIVIL WAR

[June 3, 1921]

THE American Negro is no longer "docile and easily lynched," as Mr. Dooley once described him. He is asserting his right to live under the white man's law and have the privileges and immunities and guarantees of that law. So long as he is denied that right in whole or in part the way is open to the repetition of such tragedies as that which cost so many lives and destroyed \$1,500,000 in property at Tulsa, Okla.

The civil war that took place in that city between whites and blacks had its origin in lynch law. A Negro had attacked a white girl in the elevator of a department store and was arrested. Immediately the rumor spread that he was to be lynched. Negroes with arms went to the jail to protect him. White men with arms followed them. The police did nothing. Then a white man tried to seize a gun from a Negro, and what then took place is described for *The World's* readers by Richard Lloyd Jones, publisher of the *Tulsa Tribune*:

The blacks were reinforced by other blacks. The whites hurried for arms. The city was in darkness. Stores having firearms in stock were smashed into. The blacks and the whites in growling groups began to parade the streets. Two hours before midnight the battle began.



Government ceased for the time being to exist and the streets of Tulsa ran with blood. But in vast sections of the country government has a habit of ceasing to exist where the legal rights of the Negro are concerned. Had the offense in question been committed by a white man the law would presumably have taken its course. Although white men are sometimes lynched when accused of crime, the general presumption is that they will not be. Although black men are often not lynched when accused of crime, the general presumption in many parts of the United States is that they are likely to be. Out of that presumption came Tulsa's race war.

A great change has come over the American Negro's attitude toward the white man's government during the last four years, a change for which the war was largely responsible. The Negro was conscripted like any other citizen. He was put into a uniform, given a rifle and sent to France to fight for his country. He was good enough to die for the flag, and naturally he refuses longer to believe that he is not entitled to privileges and immunities for which the flag stands. He is no longer submissive but aggressive, and while this change has its grave dangers to the Negro himself, it is an inevitable consequence of the failure of local and State Governments to administer even-handed justice.

It is the fashion to attribute most of the recent race riots to economic rivalry between whites and blacks, but economic rivalry is no new thing. For more than fifty years there has been an irresponsible conflict between the blacks and the so-called "poor whites," and this conflict is bound to go on as long as the two races compete for their daily bread. Rivalry, however, is not riot, and back of all these miniature civil wars which disgrace the Nation from year to year is the break-down of government and the denial of due process of law to the Negro.

Lincoln said that this Government could not endure

half slave and half free. It cannot endure with one law for the white man and another law for the black man. There must be one law for both, and until there is one law for both every community of mixed population is living under the shadow of threatened anarchy.

### GOVERNMENT BY MINORITIES

[February 11, 1922]

ANY well-organized minority can terrorize Congress. The Advocates of a Soldier Bonus are a well-organized minority, and Congress will, of course, surrender to them.

No mystery hedges about the supremacy of the organized minority in the dictation of legislation. The American political system works to its advantage all along the line. The first consideration of a member of Congress is to be re-elected. In order to be re-elected he must first be renominated, and here is where the organized minority first comes in. It can raid the primaries and where it cannot prevent the renomination of a Representative who has refused to be subservient it can make the primary very expensive for him in money and in trouble. He can never be sure that the people who agree with him will take the trouble to vote, but he can always be sure that the people who are against him will go to the polls bright and early.

When the election takes place a still greater advantage lies with the organized minority. It ceases to have partisan affiliations and drives straight toward its objective. In many districts a very slight shift in the vote will overturn a normal majority, and there are few districts outside of the South in which a nomination spells certain election. It is inevitable, then, that Representatives and Senators should follow the line of least resistance and

invite no organized opposition that can be capitalized at the ballot-box.

Had Mr. Harding stood by the policy that he defined last July, the Republican members of Congress would at least have had an alibi in their campaign for re-election. In reply to the American Legion lobby they could have said that they had supported the Administration, and that is an argument which in ordinary circumstances carries great weight with a constituency. But when the President wobbled they were left without support, and few of them have the stuff out of which political heroes are made. Under aggressive leadership they can often be induced to fight to the last ditch, but they will not remain there and die when they find that their Commander-in-Chief has discreetly retired to a strategic position several miles in the rear.

When Mr. Harding quit, the bonus became inevitable, and what Congress is seeking now is a form of taxation that will apply only to unorganized elements that are unlikely to combine to resist it. This will take time. A tentative programme of bonus taxation has already been prepared by a sub-committee of the House Committee on Ways and Means, but it is doubtful if it stands. The farmers will object to the tax on gasoline and the tax on automobiles, and the farmers are organized. The suggested tax on stock transfers will be fought in Wall Street, and Wall Street has a way of shutting off campaign contributions when it is offended.

What the leaders in Congress are now engaged in doing is sending up trial balloons to test the strength of the resistance to various methods of raising revenue to pay the bonus. Taxes that are likely to be met with serious reprisals will be abandoned. Those that affect only the people that cannot protect themselves will be retained.

Congress knows that any form of bonus taxation is dangerous, but it also knows that the failure to provide

## THE CONDUCT OF LIFE

for a bonus is likely to be still more dangerous. It has had much experience with well-organized minorities that are ready to break down party lines to achieve their ends, and its own motto is "Safety First."

Mr. Harding could have prevented this bonus muddle. It is probable that he could still prevent it if he would meet the issue courageously, but he too is playing for safety. He believes that the bonus is bad, but he thinks that the loss of Congress would be worse; so the President has taken to cover, along with Congress, and only the Secretary of the Treasury is left outside the breast-works.

## THE FORGOTTEN MAN

[September 3, 1922]

NEARLY forty years ago Prof. William A. Sumner of Yale prepared a lecture entitled "The Forgotten Man." That lecture has since taken its place among the classic American contributions to political economy.

"The Forgotten Man" was never more timely than it is now, and it would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the American people if President Harding and Congress could be persuaded to study it until Sumner's thought had become part of their own mental processes—or if they could learn only this much:

Wealth comes only from production, and all that the wrangling grabbers, loafers and robbers get to deal with comes from somebody's toil and sacrifice. Who, then, is he who provides it all? Go and find him, and you will have once more before you the Forgotten Man.

You will find him hard at work because he has a great many to support. Nature has done a great deal for him in giving him a fertile soil and an excellent climate, and he wonders why it is that, after all, his scale of comfort is so

moderate. He has to get out of the soil enough to pay all his taxes, and that means the cost of all the jobs and the fund for all the plunder. The Forgotten Man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and school, reading his newspaper and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

Such is the Forgotten Man. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but he always pays—yes, above all, he pays.

The Forgotten Man was never more completely forgotten than he is now. Congress does not know that he exists. The President suspects that there is such a person, who may turn up at the polls in November, but he is not quite sure.

In the meantime the Forgotten Man has been given over to be plundered. Congress is helping the sugar crowd rob him, the woolen crowd rob him, the cotton manufacturers rob him, the steel crowd rob him, and left him at the mercy of the profiteers in every line of trade.

Mr. Gompers boasts that the Industrial aristocrats of the American Federation of Labor are still within 5 per cent of their war-time wages, but the Forgotten Man has been liquidated until the limit of his capacity has been reached. Yet he must take up the burden again to pay for the cost of the railroad strike and the long row between the executives and the union leaders over seniority. He must pay for the coal strike, with the operators and the miners splitting the unearned increment. Not only must he pay but he must skimp himself on fuel because it has been necessary to exhaust all the reserve stocks of coal in order to enable the trade to fix a price that makes it worth while for the operators and the unions to divide the swag.

It is the Forgotten Man who will ultimately pay for the Soldiers' Bonus, for the ship subsidy and for all the grandiose schemes of Congress, and he will pay for these

in odd hours when he is not already busy in paying the cost of the war. In order to encourage him a monopoly tariff is to be imposed on him, to advance the price of everything he uses and give every privileged interest an opportunity to take something more away from him as he goes back and forth to his work.

No lobbies ever represent the Forgotten Man in Washington. He is neither incorporated nor organized. He cannot pass the increased prices along, because he is the ultimate consumer as well as the initial producer. His function in the scheme of things is to work and to pay—and to believe what his Representative and his Senator tell him about the glories of the Government.

## CHAPTER XIII

### PUBLIC OPINION

**B**UT after all, the least dangerous thing that the most disloyal can do is to talk or scribble." So Mr. Cobb wrote only four months after the United States entered the War. From the beginning of our participation in it he never yielded to the theory that the country could be safeguarded against treason or the slightest impediment of pacifism by shutting off free speech. After the War he took the lead in denouncing interference with free speech and a free press by the passage of the Lusk bills in New York State and similar activities elsewhere of silly reactionaries who are now regretting their headstrong haste.

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN WAR

[August 26, 1917]

THERE is no more difficult or delicate task in time of war than to define the legal limitations of freedom of speech and of the press.

Mayor Mitchel has undertaken to do so in relation to certain orators and newspapers of radical Irish propaganda, but he has not been altogether successful. These orators and newspapers are frankly disloyal to the United States. They preach sedition. They oppose the war policies of the Government. They try to incite public opposition to the sending of troops to France. They are

morally, if not legally, guilty of treason; yet the words of Judge Cooley in his "Constitutional Limitations" remain, perhaps, the wisest words on the subject:

Repression of full and free discussion is dangerous to any government resting upon the will of the people. The people cannot fail to see that they are deprived of rights, and will be certain to become discontented when their discussion of public measures is sought to be circumscribed by the judgment of others upon their temperance or fairness.

They must be left at liberty to speak with the freedom which the magnitude of their supposed wrongs appears in their minds to demand, and if they exceed all the proper bounds of moderation the consolation must be that the evil likely to spring from the violent discussion will probably be less and its correction by public sentiment more speedy than if the terrors of the law were brought to bear to prevent the discussion.

We have no doubt that much of this propaganda has been bought in the open market with German money, yet we can find no evidence that it has proved anything but a losing investment to those who financed it. This fact, too, must be taken into consideration in estimating the need of legal measures.

The same principle applies to the 'disloyal Suffragist campaign in Washington, which the local police have so badly muddled. The seriousness of the Suffragist offense does not lie in the banners denouncing "Kaiser Wilson" or in the other ridiculous sentiments that are flaunted, but in the disorder created about the White House gates by the Suffragists and their antagonists. That endangers the President and should be sternly repressed.

If the Washington police did their duty they would close off the White House grounds and keep everybody away who did not have legitimate business. No crowds of any kind would be allowed to congregate there. Then let the Suffragists parade and picket anywhere else they pleased, protecting them in the exercise of their rights as



everybody else is protected and remembering that it is no crime to be a fool.

The rule that applies to the Sinn Fein Irish, the Socialists and the I. W. W. applies to the militant Suffragists and all the other assistant Germans who are trying to bedevil the Government of the United States when all its energies are needed for the prosecution of a great war. Democracies are always getting into trouble, as Elihu Root said, and the scum is always rising to the surface. But, after all, the least dangerous thing that the most disloyal American can do is to talk or scribble. Nothing serious is likely to come of that, unless there is a direct appeal to the use of force in resisting the Government. For such appeals there is law in abundance.

The free play of public opinion can be trusted in war as well as in peace, and it is well to trust it.

When we sum up all the results of this disloyal propaganda what do we find? That the American people are beginning to waver in the support of their Government? Not at all. Never in the whole history of the United States was there relatively so great a body of public opinion on the side of a war Administration and so little opposition that could command a respectable following. The more talking there is on the part of Germany's agents and assistant agents the more firmly resolved the country is to see the thing through and crush Prussianism.

What is needed is not stern suppression of all seditious and disloyal utterance, regardless of law, but a counter-campaign in the name of patriotism and human freedom. How can any government consistently prosecute a soap-box orator for uttering sentiments that are expressed daily in the halls of Congress and circulated at public expense in the *Congressional Record*? But it is as easy for patriots as for traitors to organize public meetings. It is as easy to arrange demonstrations in favor of the Government as against it, and the most pow-

erful weapon against disloyal propaganda is loyal propaganda.

### TOO MUCH CENSORSHIP

[December 14, 1917]

"I BELIEVE that self-governing peoples fight better when they have full knowledge of the situation," said Premier Clemenceau in reply to the American Publicity League's representations that much greater knowledge of war conditions is needed in America. All the experience of the war goes to sustain the belief of the French Premier.

There is too much censorship, and it breeds ceaseless political conflict. A case in point is the investigation into the conduct of the war which the Senate Committee on Military Affairs is conducting. When Gen. Crozier was asked by a member of the committee whether a public statement of conditions in the Ordnance Department might do great harm, he replied that the facts were not secret. That applies practically to everything the committee is likely to bring out.

This investigation is largely the product of a censorship that has tried to suppress everything, the good along with the bad. The chief sufferer is the Government itself, which has to take the responsibility for every petty blunder that can be exposed and at the same time is robbed of the full credit for one of the most wonderful military achievements in history.

Englishmen and Frenchmen are much more enthusiastic about the war accomplishments of the United States than Americans, partly because they actually know more about the work of the United States than the ordinary American knows and partly because their experience enables them to put a better estimate on its value. The

American people do not know. Consequently they are disposed to believe all kinds of silly gossip and magnify every trivial mistake or difference of opinion.

Nothing has been brought out by the Senate committee which could not have been told long ago, and which, in fact, was not known in the offices of most of the great newspapers. All of it might far better have been published in the run of the day's news than to be published now.

It is assumed by critics that the censorship is employed mainly to hide blunders. Whatever may have been the case in Europe, that is not the case here, where the censorship has been used chiefly to conceal or minimize the extraordinary work that the Government has done in the last eight months. The blunders that have been hidden are of little importance in comparison with the vast military results that have been achieved. Yet the net effect of the Senate investigation is to centre the mind of the Nation upon all the errors and defects of judgment that have been committed in the process of establishing the country upon a war basis and to exclude all the history-making things from consideration.

Except for the actual transportation of troops and the movement of ships, the censorship is a liability both to the Government and the people. It keeps them apart when they ought to be brought together, and it is more than doubtful if it withholds any information from the enemy. The censorship is the child of military bureaucracy, and military bureaucracy furnishes the poorest sort of judgment upon which Government can rely in a crisis.

The time spent by the Senate investigators and by their witnesses will not be altogether wasted if it results in a restriction of the censorship to actual military secrets and brings the American people back into the confidence of their Government, which needs their fullest support and has little to conceal from them. *The World* knows

of nothing that would bring to the American people more pride and enthusiasm in sustaining the war policies of the President than a full and complete record of the work of the United States Government since April 6.

## PUBLIC OPINION

[Address before the Women's City Club of New York,  
December 11, 1919]

FOR five years there has been no free play of public opinion in the world.

Confronted by the inexorable necessities of war, Governments conscripted public opinion as they conscripted men and money and materials.

Having conscripted it, they dealt with it as they dealt with other raw recruits. They mobilized it. They put it in charge of drill sergeants. They goose-stepped it. They taught it to stand at attention and salute.

This governmental control over public opinion was exerted through two different channels—one the censorship and the other propaganda. The ostensible function of the censorship was to keep the enemy from obtaining useful military information. Its ultimate function was to suppress all information that Government wished to suppress for any reason whatsoever. There is a popular notion, born of cynicism and suspicion, that the legitimate objects of the censorship were deliberately prostituted to the business of concealing military and administrative blunders. I am inclined to doubt it. There are instances in which it was so employed, but on the whole the censor usually followed the ordinary military routine, suppressing everything that might give aid to the enemy and then suppressing everything else for which his superior officers might criticize him for not suppressing. The censor's motto was "safety first," which meant safety for

the censor. In consequence, the censorship was usually stupid and generally ineffective. *Figaro* once maliciously remarked that the French censorship had managed to keep the movements of the French troops a secret from everybody except the Germans. That was true, in the main, of all censorships.

As the war progressed the censorship became less and less a factor, and propaganda increased in importance. Modern warfare is not a conflict between armies, but between nations, and what is going on back of the lines may be far more important than what is going on at the front. Governments relied on propaganda to equip and sustain their armies, to raise money, to furnish food and munitions, and to perform all those services without which armies would be vain and helpless. The organized manipulation of public opinion was as inevitable a development of modern warfare as airplanes, tanks and barbed-wire entanglements.

There were two kinds of propaganda, one that represented the appeal to reason and the other that represented the appeal to any emotions that could be directed toward the winning of the war. The classical examples of the first kind of propaganda are the British White Book, which contained the diplomatic correspondence that preceded the war, and the State papers of President Wilson defining the aims and objects of the war in terms of human liberty.

The effect of this kind of propaganda can not be overestimated. Without it the war could not have been won.

The other kind of propaganda resembled in a general way the activities of the cheer leaders at a football game. It was noisy and demonstrative and emotional and spectacular, and as such it often served a highly useful purpose. Sometimes it was frankly mendacious, for mendacity plays no insignificant rôle in the drama of war.

When Government lies it does not lie sneakingly and furtively, but proudly and ostentatiously.

When the Armistice was signed and demobilization began, public opinion was demobilized, too. It was turned loose to shift for itself and naturally it felt a little awkward in civilian clothes. It had been trained to think only in terms of war and had almost forgotten how to think in terms of peace. Moreover, it was like the emancipated slaves of the South after the Civil War. Its shackles were struck off, but it did not quite know what to do with its freedom. It was in the habit of being told what to think and what to feel, and when it was left to its own resources it was bewildered. At this point private propaganda stepped in to take up the work that Government had abandoned, and when we deal with public opinion today we are dealing largely with private propaganda.

Government suppressed the truth; Government distorted the truth; Government lied glibly and magnificently when occasion seemed to require; but, after all, governmental propaganda was at least directed toward war ends, and those ends were the protection of the country and its institutions against its armed and embattled enemies.

When we come to the question of private propaganda we are on wholly different ground. Private propaganda is not one of the by-products of war, but it has taken on new phases since the war. It established itself long before the war and was a development of the press agent, who from being merely a theatrical attachment, had extended himself to Wall Street, to big business, and to most of the institutions that have to deal with public opinion. Shortly before the war the newspapers of New York took a census of the press agents who were regularly employed and regularly accredited and found that there were about 1,200 of them.

How many there are now I do not pretend to know, but what I do know is that many of the direct channels to news have been closed, and the information for the public is first filtered through publicity agents.

The great corporations have them, the banks have them, the railroads have them, all the organizations of business and of social and political activity have them, and they are the media through which news comes. Even statesmen have them.

These publicity agents, on the whole, are a very able body of men, and in some respects they perform a highly valuable service, but at the same time they are essentially attorneys for their employers. Their function is not to proclaim the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, but to present the particular state of facts that will be of the greatest benefit to their clients—in short, to manipulate the news.

A great deal of the confusion of public opinion today is the direct by-product of that system.

Take, for example, a great industrial disturbance, like the coal strike. What are the essential merits of it? Do you know? If you do, you are very fortunate. I don't, although I have spared no effort to get at the facts, many of which lie further underground than the coal itself.

The reason none of us can get at the basic truth is very simple. The coal operators meet in secret, and through their publicity agent they give out a statement of their side of the case. The leaders of the miners meet in secret, and they give out a statement of their side of the case. Either statement by itself is plausible and believable. The two of them, taken together, are wholly irreconcilable and simply add to the sum total of human ignorance.

And thus it goes. The more of that kind of publicity we have the less we know, the less certain we can be of

anything. But while this is a pernicious propaganda it is by no means the most dangerous form that is now manifesting itself.

After the Thirty Years' War bands of marauding soldiers wandered around Europe terrorizing the inhabitants of every town and village to which they could gain access, and something of that sort is going on now in the United States. Bands of propagandists are wandering around terrorizing public opinion and trying to frighten it into submission to theories of government that are strange to American institutions.

Some of these marauders represent radicalism and some reaction, but there is a striking similarity in their methods. Radicalism appeals to violence against reaction, and reaction appeals to violence against radicalism. One menaces with threats of the torch and the bomb and the other with threats of the rope and the rifle. Both profess to be champions of human freedom. Radicalism pretends to be engaged in restoring human liberty to its primitive simplicity, and reaction, wrapped in the Stars and Stripes, is ready to have everybody else die for the Constitution as it thinks the Constitution ought to be interpreted.

A war that has shaken the very foundations of human society is bound to produce some extraordinary mental reactions. A war that has wrecked vast empires, overthrown dynasties, and brought about sweeping revolutions is not likely to leave society just as it was before. Yet large numbers of excellent people think that mankind should have picked up its work where it left off when it went into the trenches and go on as if nothing at all had happened. Others are convinced that because war has resulted in revolution in certain countries there ought to be revolution everywhere—the more the better.

What the United States needs more than anything else today is the restoration of the free play of public



opinion. That requires, first, the reestablishment of the freedom of discussion, for without freedom of discussion there is no public opinion that deserves the name.

Will Hays, the chairman of the Republican national committee, made a speech recently in New York, in which he proudly proclaimed that "There is in this country a religious faith which believes in the divine origin of the Constitution of the United States." When I first read Mr. Hays's words I was staggered by this new incarnation of Hohenzollernism. Then I saw that he had probably hit upon a serious and lamentable truth. A most energetic propaganda is engaged in converting the Constitution of the United States into a cult, into a religion, and its champions are eager to burn all dissenters and heretics at the stake.

The Constitution of the United States is one of the great achievements of all history, but criticism of it is not blasphemy, and a man is not necessarily damned who thinks that in the light of 130 years' experience a better framework of government might be constructed.

The men who drafted the Constitution certainly did not consider it a piece of divine inspiration. They knew how it was made. Nor had they any superstitious reverence for government as an institution. They regarded it rather as a necessary evil. Nor were they altogether certain, from the meager data of a limited experience, as to the ability of the people to rule themselves. That is why they established a government of checks and balances which could not function too freely. To this day the Government they created operates with great difficulty under even favorable conditions, and whenever the President and Congress happen to belong to different parties government is deadlocked and must wait for another election. But what the fathers did clearly understand was human liberty, at least in so far as the white man was concerned, and there they took nothing for granted.

It is not the powers that they conferred upon the Government, but the powers that they prohibited to the Government which make the Constitution a charter of liberty. The Bill of Rights is a born rebel. It reeks of sedition. In every clause it shakes its fist in the face of constituted authority and thunders "Thou shalt not," and because its ultimatum is "Thou shalt not" it is the one guaranty of human freedom to the American people unless they themselves destroy their safeguard.

We are in danger of forgetting this under the terrorism of mass thought, but we can forget it only at our imminent peril. There is revolution in reaction as well as in radicalism, and Toryism, speaking a jargon of law and order, may often be a graver menace to liberty than radicalism bellowing the empty phrases of the soap-box demagogue.

Writing from Paris to Abigail Adams, Thomas Jefferson said that—

The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions that I wish it always to be kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all.

If the author of the Declaration of Independence were to utter such a sentiment today, the Post Office Department could exclude him from the mail, grand juries could indict him for sedition and criminal syndicalism, legislative committee could seize his private papers and search them for evidence of bolshevism, and United States Senators would be clamoring for his deportation on the ground that he had been tainted with the ribald doctrines of the French Revolution and should be sent back to live with the rest of the terrorists.

Thus the political philosophy of one generation becomes the political anathema of another.

Now, I am not much disposed to agree with Jefferson's dictum on the moral duty of resistance to govern-

ment unless it is abundantly qualified. Nevertheless all the liberties that we hold today have come from resistance to government, and most of them were won by blood and iron. Thanks to the men who were willing to challenge authority and die for liberty, we, their political heirs, have been armed with newer and better weapons.

To Abraham Lincoln the issue of the Civil War was very simple. It was that "among free men there can be no successful appeal from the ballot to the bullet." There we are on solid ground. With universal suffrage that is a foundation which can never be shaken and we can build on it in complete confidence. Under free institutions whatever can be taken to the ballot box has the inalienable right to make its appeal to the ballot box. Whatever denies the final authority of the ballot box is a challenge to the Republic, and that alone is a challenge.

This standard of judgment can be applied to all the unrest and discontent to which the country is now subjected. In so far as discontent appeals directly to violence there is an abundance of law to meet it if public officials, municipal, State, and Federal, will discharge the commonplace duties of their offices. In so far as it appeals to public opinion and the ordinary processes of representative government we need not be disturbed for the safety of the Republic unless we lack faith in popular institutions and believe that at heart the American people are destitute of sense and sanity and incapable of self-rule.

The policy of repression that has been generally adopted by governors, mayors, and police officials—in some cases by Federal authority—to meet this propaganda of radicalism is fatal. Two thousand years of history bear witness to its folly. Nobody ever succeeded in bettering the weather by putting the thermometer in jail, and nobody will ever remove the causes of unrest and discontent by trying to suppress their manifestations.

Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court recently said in a dissenting opinion in a sedition case that "the best test of the truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." That will always remain the best test of truth, and we can not afford to tamper with it, however strong the immediate provocation may be, nor can we afford to suppress that competition.

In a speech delivered in Carnegie Hall last week a very eminent New York lawyer, Mr. Henry W. Taft, complained that the Department of Justice was shifting to the States the duty of prosecuting radicals, and asked: "But is not the protection of American people against revolutionary propaganda peculiarly within the function of the Federal Government?" The protection of the people against crime and violence and the destruction of property is an elementary function of government. But government protecting the American people against revolutionary propaganda is a new manifestation of paternal authority. I wonder what old Sam Adams would say to that? Or Patrick Henry? Or Benjamin Franklin, with his grim joke about hanging together or hanging separately? Or Thomas Jefferson? Or George Washington? Or all the rest of that noble congregation of rebels who to their defiance of George III pledged their lives and their fortunes and their sacred honor?

This theory that it is the duty of government to protect the people from propaganda is Prussianism. It was the gospel of His Imperial Majesty, the German Kaiser. Protecting people from revolutionary propaganda was one of his most sacred functions. Now there is no Imperial Majesty and no German Kaiser, and no *majestäts-beleidigung* and no divine right. Autocratic Russia saw the doctrine in its fullest flower, and it was eventually followed by the most horrible, by the most ghastly, by the most degrading revolution known to human history.

Significantly enough, no sooner was this new tyranny established than Lenin and Trotsky proceeded in their turn to "protect the people from revolutionary propaganda" by suppressing all but the Bolshevik newspapers.

Either the people are fit to govern or they are not. If they are fit to govern it is no function of government to protect them from any kind of propaganda. They will protect themselves. That capacity for self-protection is the very essence of self-government. Without it popular institutions are inconceivable, and the moment that a republican form of government sets itself up as the nursemaid of the people, to train their immature minds to suit its own purposes and to guard them from all influences that it considers contaminating, we already have a revolution and a revolution backward, a revolution by usurpation.

How is there to be any public opinion at all if government is to be the final arbiter of political theories and economic doctrines?

When Government undertakes to regulate opinions, the burden of proof must always rest upon it. If history teaches any lesson whatever, its lesson is that the most dangerous and futile of all methods of combating erroneous political and economic beliefs is for Government to set itself up as a judge and executioner.

But, it will be said, the doctrines that Government is called upon to suppress are of foreign origin; they are advocated in large part by an alien population; they are antagonistic to the principles of the Republic, and we can not afford to have the American people adopt them. Quite true. But what of it? This is not the first time that there has been Nation-wide unrest and discontent. It is not the first time that wild and lunatic remedies have been prescribed for public ills. It is not the first time that foreign revolutionary theories have invaded the United States. It is not the first time that property rights have been attacked in their very citadel.

American conservatives were once quite as terrified by the spread in this country of the extreme theories of the French Revolution as they are now terrified by the spread of bolshevism. They were quite as eager for repression; yet the French Revolution never shattered a single American institution. It raised up no American breed of Marats and Robespierres. It set up no guillotines on American soil and beheaded no aristocrats. The American people thrashed the issue out and went on their way.

Is it not possible that they still retain a scanty remnant of their ancient common sense? Is it not possible that they might even listen to a sympathetic exposition of the maniacal principles of bolshevism without being seized with an irrepressible desire to destroy everything they have created and give themselves over to famine and disease and anarchy in order to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat?

I am not afraid of bolshevism in the open, where the American people can examine it and weigh it and consider it: I am not afraid that the American people are going to rise up en masse and join the I. W. W. to destroy the institution of their own private property, unless government prevents them by force. It is just as well to remember that the preamble of the Constitution of the United States does not begin "We the Government of the United States," but "We the people of the United States." The history of this country for more than 140 years proves that the American people can be trusted, and in the long run they can be trusted a great deal further than the professional politicians that they generally select to represent them in their government.

The failures of popular government have always been failures of public opinion—mostly of public opinion that was ill-informed, of public opinion that was denied the facts, of public opinion that was mis-

guided by self-constituted masters. That will always remain a great menace, and public opinion is never to be safeguarded by trying to prevent it by law from coming into contact with political heresy. There is no surer way to give those doctrines a foothold than to proscribe them. It is not the revolutionary doctrine which is shouted from the market place that is to be feared, but the revolutionary doctrine that is whispered everywhere in the ear of discontent and that can claim in its favor the test of martyrdom.

There is no other such prolific breeder of revolution as reaction and reaction is now engaged in capitalizing the militant patriotism that the War aroused. It is denying freedom of speech, denying freedom of assemblage—denying the most sacred guaranties of the Constitution that it professes to guard and defend.

When the French soldiers began to return home after four years in the trenches, thousands of them declared that they would never again do any work. It is sometimes seems that after the armistice was signed, millions of Americans must have taken a vow that they would never again do any thinking for themselves. They were willing to die for their country, but not willing to think for it, and under the influence of propaganda they had lost the habit of independent thought.

It is here that we squarely confront the question of the responsibility of newspapers in respect to the formation of an enlightened and fully responsible public opinion.

Of the work of the American newspapers in the war the most chronic faultfinder can not justly complain. They printed all the news that Government would permit them to print. They almost bankrupted themselves to obtain it. They were the first victims of the censorship and the daily prey of the propagandists. They never hesitated in rendering any service of which they were capable, and

they never counted the cost. On the whole, they displayed a sense of responsibility that in itself is the highest decoration for distinguished service.

When we come to the newspaper in relation to the events of the last year, it is a very different story, and a less satisfactory story. Newspapers are very human institutions, and when the fighting ceased they reacted in much the way the general public reacted. The notion was general that, with hostilities ended, prewar conditions would naturally be restored, and the newspapers followed the common notion.

That was a great mistake. They were not prepared for the waves of discontent and unrest that spread over the country. They were not prepared for the social ferment that followed the war. They were not prepared for the industrial upheavals that came. For the most part they had settled down to the comfortable assumption that with Germany beaten, with the Kaiser exiled, with the war won, everything was going to be for the best in the best possible of worlds and that is not the way it turned out at all.

When strike followed strike, when industrial disturbances became Nation-wide, when labor and capital instantly began a hand-to-hand fight over a new division of the profits and the spoils, when the labor leaders discovered that there was a tight labor market and began to squeeze the employer, just as the banks squeeze the borrower when there is a tight money market, a vast number of perfectly good and respectable people were much disturbed in their souls, and the newspapers reflected this disturbance. Instead of trying to get at the basic cause of it all, they adopted the primitive medicine-man procedure of hunting out the devil upon whom the responsibility could be laid.

Four hundred thousand steel workers had gone out because the leader of the strike had once been a syndi-



calist. All the shipping in New York was tied up because I. W. W. agitators had taken possession of 80,000 long-shoremen. Four hundred thousand miners quit in defiance of Federal law because two factions in the union were battling for control. And so it went. Nothing in this complicated world is ever quite so simple as that.

The first duty of a newspaper to public opinion is to furnish the raw materials for it and the tools for its formation. American newspapers are not doing this in respect to this new economic situation, as many newspaper men keenly realize without quite knowing how to remedy it. The war has left a new set of problems and the newspapers have not yet met them. They are not driving to the heart of things. They are still skimming the surface, and it is only now and then that a reporter gets under the skin of these great events.

This, in a way, helps to account for the more or less chaotic state of public opinion in this country, and it is doubly unfortunate, because the American people have no passion for profound study of public questions until these questions reach the stage of a crisis. Day by day they like to get their news from headlines and to rely for their judgments on what somebody tells them.

The gravest duty that confronts the American press today is to bring these vast questions that have come out of the war into the forum of public discussion. The barrier of propaganda must be broken down. The competent, independent investigating reporter must come back to his own. This is vital. The American people can not deal intelligently with any of these problems without knowing the facts, and they can not know the facts until the newspapers brush aside the propagandists of contending factions and get back to first principles of news gathering. All this is fundamental.

It is impossible of fulfillment, nevertheless, unless the newspapers set themselves squarely against this rising

Prussianism which is seeking to make a fetich out of government and endow it with the power of damnation over all dissenting political and economic beliefs. If the guaranties of the Bill of Rights are to be overridden in the name of superpatriotism, the newspapers themselves will be the ultimate victims of the new dispensation that is called to suppress freedom of speech and of the press, and we shall have no public opinion at all except that which cringes under the lash of officeholders. If Government is to be erected into a god, who of us can be sure of salvation?

Lord Acton made the security of the minority the basis of freedom, and that will always be the basis, however offensive the minority's views may be and however mischievous the principles that it advocates may appear. De Tocqueville framed essentially the same definition in still more striking form when he voiced his warning against the tyranny of the majority. The inherent sovereignty of the citizen over government was pictured by it in words that for a century and a half have been part of the political heritage of the English-speaking peoples:

The poorest man in his cottage may bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter; the rain may enter; but the King of England can not enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

Free government must forever be the resultant of all the forces that are brought to bear upon it, radical and reactionary, liberal and conservative, revolutionary and Bourbon, socialistic and individualistic, and whenever any of those forces is compelled to resort to secrecy the equilibrium is destroyed and the way is open to disaster.

What I have said tonight is not a plea for the new radicalism, for to me most of this new radicalism is the

very negation of political and economic sanity. What I am pleading for is the restoration of the traditions of the Republic, for the restoration of the proved safeguards of human liberty, for the restoration of the free play of public opinion, without which democracy is stifled and can not exist; for the restoration of the old faith of the fathers which has never yet failed the Nation in a crisis—the faith that they themselves sealed in their own blood.

God forbid that our supreme achievement in this War should be the Prussianizing of ourselves.

### GOVERNMENT BY HYSTERIA

[January 14, 1920]

JUDGE GEORGE W. ANDERSON of the United States District Court in Boston expresses the opinion that "more than 99 per cent of the pro-German plots never existed," and he doubts "whether the Red menace has any more basis in fact than the pro-German peril."

Judge Anderson was formerly the United States Attorney in Boston, charged with the duty of enforcing the law against alien enemies during the war, and he can speak with a degree of authority which few others can claim. When he declares that most of the agitators for the suppression of the so-called Red menace are "the same individuals or class of forces that in 1917 and 1918 were frightening the community to death about pro-German plots," he is again on solid ground of fact.

The methods adopted in the campaign against the radicals have not only brought the country to a state of ridiculous hysteria but they involve attacks upon the fundamental institutions of the United States that, if permitted to go on, must become absolutely destructive to American liberties.

When Speaker Sweet arbitrarily excluded the five Socialist members from the Assembly and jammed through a snap resolution he gave as an excuse for this denial of the right of the minority to representation that "you have been elected on a platform that is absolutely inimical to the best interests of the State of New York and of the United States." It is on similar grounds that the Department of Justice defends its wholesale raids against the radicals. Two political or semi-political parties have been proscribed by the Department of Justice, which holds that mere membership in two of the Communistic groups is sufficient to warrant the deportation of an alien. The Attorney-General has made his fiat law.

Many of the most eminent lawyers of New York, under the leadership of Charles E. Hughes, have declared of the action of the Assembly that—

Any attempt by a majority to exclude from the Legislature those who have been duly elected to its membership, merely because of their affiliation with a political party, is un-American, and if successful must destroy the right of minorities and the very foundations of representative government.

A slightly different principle is involved in the deportation cases, and yet these same lawyers might well undertake to determine whether any protection whatever has been afforded to the rights of the accused, not alone their rights as aliens but their rights as human beings.

Deporting an alien for crime is one thing and deporting an alien for mere opinion is another thing. In the latter case, Government is under the gravest obligations to proceed carefully and cautiously. Individual hysteria is bad enough, but a hysterical Government is a national reproach, and it is a reproach that a handful of excited or ambitious bureaucrats should not be allowed to inflict upon the entire Nation.

Most of the activities that are going on in the way of suppressing extreme radicalism are in the nature of lynch law. Officials act first and then try to find the evidence on which to sustain their action. In the mean time they are tearing up the guarantees of the Bill of Rights and destroying the essential elements of free government. Between the fools and the fanatics of the two extremes, the American people are confronting a real danger to their liberties which they can no longer afford to ignore.

It is time to get back to the Bill of Rights. It is time to get back to the Constitution. It is time to get back to due process of law. It is time to get back to first principles of free government and stay there, in equal defiance of radicalism and reaction.

### A DESPOTISM OF POLITICIANS

[January 25, 1920]

EIGHTY-FIVE years ago Alexis de Tocqueville, the most philosophic of all students of American institutions, wrote this warning to the American people:

If ever the free institutions of America are destroyed, that event may be attributed to the omnipotence of the majority, which at some future time may urge the minority to desperation, and oblige them to have recourse to physical force. Anarchy will then be the result, but it will have been brought about by despotism.

The despotism that is now engaged in flogging the American people along the road to anarchy has not even the merit of being a despotism of the majority. It is really the despotism of professional politicians who have never received a mandate from the majority and are engaged in grossly abusing the power entrusted to them.

No majority of the people of New York ever demanded the exclusion of the Socialist members from the Assembly on the ground that the Socialist platform is "absolutely inimical to the best interests of the State of New York and of the United States." The people of this State never dreamed of such a proceeding. It was the invention of Sweet and Newton and Lusk and a crew of Republican office-holders who thought they could manufacture a patriotic issue which would advance their own political interests.

No majority of the people of the United States ever demanded the tyrannical legislation against so-called sedition that Congress is trying to pass. They have asked for no sedition laws. What sentiment there is back of this legislation was worked up by politicians who thought they could get something out of it for themselves. In its report of the Graham bill, the House Judiciary Committee announces with pride that Representative Davey conducted a propaganda to arouse the country to the need of this repressive measure. Mr. Davey might have had a smaller measure of success, however, if Attorney-General Palmer had not been working the same side of the political street, and clamoring for legislation under which the Department of Justice could dragnet everybody into jail on the pretense of protecting the country from its native-born enemies.

The most autocratic institution in the white man's world is the United States Post Office Department, which does not recognize the right even of the courts to inquire into its decrees. The arbitrary powers conferred upon the Post Office Department were not the result of the "omnipotence of the majority" that de Tocqueville feared. The American people never asked to have their Post Office Department erected into a despotism. That was done by a handful of bureaucrats working hand in hand with Congress.

The Eighteenth Amendment is another case in point. The Constitution of the United States has been radically changed, the relation between the Federal Government and the individual citizen has been revolutionized, and no voter ever had a chance to express his opinion about it at the polls.

The tyranny under which the American people are now living is not a tyranny of the majority, but a tyranny of politicians and office-holders in partnership with propaganda. The initiative is with them, and they have fixed it so that the referendum is also with them. They control all the political machinery, and have intrenched themselves behind laws which, although devised to make political parties subservient to popular opinion, have made them the property of managing politicians.

No other country in the world is suffering so much from professional politics as the United States, and if the campaign of 1920 presents any opportunity whatever to the American people it is the opportunity to make themselves again the masters of their own institutions.

## A LEGISLATIVE LYNCHING

[April 2, 1920]

THE legislative lynching that took place yesterday in Albany was decided upon nearly three months ago when Speaker Sweet suspended five Socialist members of the Assembly on the ground that the platform on which they were elected "is absolutely inimical to the best interests of the State of New York and of the United States."

The hearing before the Judiciary Committee was merely a concession to form. Having set out to promote his candidacy for Governor by expelling the Socialist Assemblymen in proof of his militant "100 per cent

'Americanism," Speaker Sweet was obliged to see the thing through, in spite of the protests of bar associations and of the ablest and most responsible members of his party.

It is not difficult for a Speaker to carry out such a programme. He appoints the committees and is the master of legislation. No member who offends him is likely to receive much consideration on local bills, which are often the measure of his value to his constituents, and so the fiat of an arbitrary Speaker easily becomes law.

This is what happened at Albany, and by the irony of fate Mr. Sweet's programme was consummated on All Fools' Day.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to every State "a republican form of government." That form of government has ceased for the time being to exist in New York. There can be no republican form of government when minority parties are arbitrarily outlawed, when representation is denied, when legally elected and legally qualified members of the Legislature are expelled because their political principles are offensive to the majority, when whole constituencies are arbitrarily disfranchised because they refuse to vote the way somebody else thinks they ought to vote.

This is the negation of republican government. In effect it sets up the principle that minorities have no rights that majorities are bound to respect, that all constitutional remedies are denied to them and that they must resort to violence for the promotion of their political beliefs and for the redress of their grievances. Even the Kaiser never went as far as Sweet has gone. Even the Prussian Junkers were never able to throw the German Socialists out of the Reichstag.

The action of the Assembly makes the re-establishment of representative government the vital concern of every man and woman in New York who believes in American institutions and is determined to maintain them.



Under the law there will be no special elections to which the expelled Assemblymen can appeal, but there will be a general election in the fall, and so far has *The World* is concerned it intends to support these Assemblymen for re-election.

During all the years of its existence this newspaper has been uncompromisingly opposed to Socialism both in theory and in practice; it remains uncompromisingly opposed to Socialism both in theory and in practice; but the political and economic beliefs of these five men have now become of no importance in relation to the vital issue that is raised by their expulsion.

If the people of New York are to retain their free institutions, if they are not to be Russianized by their stupid politicians, their first concern must be the restoration of representative government which was overthrown yesterday in Albany by the Assembly.

### FREE SPEECH—ITS VALUE AND ITS PERILS

[Address before the New York Economic Club,  
April 6, 1920]

BISMARCK tells in his memoirs of a certain Gen. von Canitz who used to deliver lectures at the Military School on the campaigns of Napoleon. Whenever a young officer asked him why Napoleon omitted this movement or that movement, the lecturer was wont to exclaim: "Well, you see just what this Napoleon was; a really good-hearted fellow, but stupid."

There is a school of Junker thought in this country which holds a similar opinion in regard to the men who framed the Government of the United States. The Fathers of the Republic were really good-hearted fellows, but stupid, and being stupid, they did not know what they were doing when they imposed their rigid limitations on

the Federal authority in order to safeguard the liberty of the individual.

There seems to be a wide-spread belief that radicalism was born yesterday and that incendiary speech is an invention of the Bolsheviki, and that, such phenomena being quite without precedent in the history of the human race, we should proceed to improvise methods of dealing with them which will, somehow, make the punishment fit a new and peculiarly heinous crime that is obviously inspired by the devil for the corruption of what would otherwise be an earthly paradise.

As it happens, radicalism and incendiary speech are just as old as the institution of government, however old that may be—perhaps a day or two younger, for we must allow a reasonable time for discontent to get its bearings in relation to the status quo.

The men who drafted and ratified the Constitution of the United States had no abiding faith in the infallibility of government. They had had much experience of government themselves, and knew something of the abuses to which it was subject. Jealous of their rights and jealous of their liberties, they undertook to protect themselves against all invasion, even an invasion of the majority. Although they omitted the Bill of Rights from the original draft of the Constitution, they did this because, having established a government of enumerated and delegated powers, they believed that this government had no power to set aside any of the guarantees of the Bill of Rights. As Hamilton expressed it:

For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do? For instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained when no power is given by which restrictions shall be imposed?

Nevertheless the American people were not 'disposed' to take anything for granted, and as a condition of rati-

fication they insisted that the Bill of Rights be made a part of the Constitution, by way of assurance that there would be no encroachments upon fundamental rights.

The safeguards to human liberty thus embedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights represented everything that had been won throughout long centuries in resistance to tyranny and despotism and arbitrary government. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus was not to be suspended except in cases of rebellion or invasion, when the public safety might require. No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law was to be passed. The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, was to be by jury. Congress was to make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people to assemble peacefully and petition for a redress of grievances. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures was affirmed, and no warrant was to issue except on probable cause supported by oath.

In nothing was their inherent distrust of government more strikingly revealed than in the clause relating to treason. They left nothing to chance. "Treason against the United States," they said, "shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

My excuse for reciting these ancient formulæ is that they were written into the organic law of the United States by men who believed that they were worth fighting for and worth dying for—by men who had themselves gone down into the valley of the shadow of death in order to give to these principles an eternal life.

In one form or another, it has been said many times

that what we learn from history is that men learn nothing from history; but there are usually exceptions to every rule. We need go back only a century and a quarter to find in our own annals a complete parallel to the present situation in respect to radicalism and freedom of speech, but whether we are prepared to learn anything from it is another matter.

The clamor for sedition laws, for the deportation of aliens who advocate communistic theories of government, for the expulsion of socialists from legislative bodies on the ground that their platform is inimical to the best interests of the state, for the stern repression of all utterance and opinion which can be twisted into a plea for resistance by forcible means to established economic and political institutions—all this is a reaction from the Russian Revolution.

There was a similar reaction in the United States from the French Revolution. The radicals hailed it as the dawn of a new emancipation for mankind. The conservative classes regarded it as a saturnalia of the anti-Christ. The specter of the guillotine haunted them; the possibility that their own property would be confiscated by the mob terrorized them.

The country was soon divided into two parties, one the champions of the French Revolution, the other profoundly antagonistic to it in all its manifestations. Washington struggled desperately to maintain the balance, and that part of his Farewell Address which is held in such austere veneration by every opponent of the League of Nations was in reality a plea to his hysterical fellow-countrymen not to permit their pro-French sympathies or their pro-British sympathies to wreck the Federal Republic that they had succeeded in establishing.

In Adams's administration, the quarrel between the United States Government and the Directory brought the issue to a head. The Anti-Federalists were vehement in

their support of the French and were commonly denounced as Jacobins by the Federalists. The Federalists were in control of the Government in all its branches; they were the party of property and their leaders decided that it was time to set the heel of the Federal authority upon the neck of this godless French radicalism which was ruining the United States.

The result was the Alien and Sedition laws, and the result of the Alien and Sedition laws was the utter destruction of the Federalist party which enacted them.

Except slavery no other issue in the United States ever bred such a bitter and impassioned political contest as the French Revolution, or one which so greatly affected the history of the country. Yet when we came to examine the actual influence that the doctrines of the French Revolution exerted upon the American institutions we cannot find a trace.

The attempt to smother freedom of speech and of the press in order to protect the American people from the infection of French radicalism brought about the annihilation of the responsible Federalist party, it made Thomas Jefferson President of the United States, and John Marshall was disposed to class Jefferson with the "absolute terrorists," yet the radicals who followed the leadership of Jefferson never adopted a single policy of the French Revolution, a fact that might profitably be considered by all the timid souls who are panic-stricken lest the American people go over to Bolshevism bag and baggage if they are permitted to talk about it except in terms of fevered denunciation.

An eminent American historian has compared the enactment of the Alien and Sedition laws to the momentary hysteria of the persecution of Salem witchcraft, and we are going through another period of witchcraft hysteria in consequence of the Russian Revolution which has appealed to the imagination of certain groups in much the

same manner that the French Revolution appealed, although it has awakened the enthusiastic support of a very much smaller fraction of the population.

Gentlemen who modestly describe themselves as 100 per cent Americans and conduct themselves in the manner of 150 per cent Americans, have set themselves up as the guardians of the country against political and economic heresy, yet I often wonder who gave them their credentials and signed their commissions.

Whatever defects the American people may have, lack of patriotism is not one of them. In all history there is no record of a more devoted and passionate loyalty than that which the American people voluntarily gave to their Government during the recent War. In spite of the heterogeneous mixture of races, in spite of the fact that to millions of men and women the conflict between the United States and the Central Powers took on all the attributes of a civil war, with brother battling against brother, the patriotism of the American people was almost religious in the fervor of its passion. No request of the Government was ever denied. No sacrifice was ever shirked.

Now that the War is won we are asked to believe that all this militant patriotism has suddenly turned to passive treason, and that the American people are ready to destroy their own institutions because certain economically discontented elements of the population have become infatuated with the Russian Revolution as some of our ancestors were with the French Revolution.

I have been asked tonight to discuss the perils as well as the value of free speech. Most of the perils lie in repression. There is likely to be far more danger in the limitations than in the free speech itself, however foolish and intemperate the speech may be. If there were any virtue in repression, the Bourbons would still be on the throne of France, the Romanoffs would still be on the

throne of Russia, Spain would still be a great empire, the Hapsburgs would still rule a Holy Roman Empire, and the Federalist party might still be in power in Washington.

I am well aware that unrestricted freedom of speech in respect to political and economic matters may often be a nuisance and may sometimes be a menace, but life is filled with nuisances and menaces, and clumsy attempts to cure them by drastic remedies have uniformly proved worse than the disease. The punishment of opinion is always dangerous. If we have not learned that, we have indeed learned nothing from history.

It is true that freedom of speech may be easily abused. It is true that fanatics and demagogues not infrequently appeal to violence. But appeals to violence, even the most reckless and sinister appeals, do not necessarily produce violence. In fact they rarely produce violence, and when they do, the instigator is no less guilty than the actual participants in the crime itself.

The extent to which Congress may, under the Constitution, interfere with free speech was long ago declared by a unanimous Supreme Court in these words:

The question in every case is whether the words are used in such circumstances, and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree.

It is a safe rule in every case that the evil must be real, the danger must be an actual danger, "a clear and present danger" as the Court said, not a remote or conjectural danger, and when that danger exists there is no lack of law to meet the situation. But when Government attempts to infer an intent from an opinion, and then punish the intent as a criminal act, it is engaged in a highly hazardous proceeding. It would not be difficult to main-

tain the thesis that the amount of violence which has resulted from incendiary speech is infinitesimal when compared with the amount of violence that has resulted from the efforts of Government to suppress manifestations of discontent.

There can be no hard and fast test of what is a proper public utterance and what is an improper utterance. It all depends upon circumstances, and if men were never allowed to speak unless they spoke wisely, a great silence would brood upon the earth.

The punishment of political offenses, even those that by their nature compel punishment, has always been one of the most hazardous occupations in which Government can engage. There is no other enmity that persists so long as that which these punishments engender. There is no other thirst for revenge that remains so long unquenched. As Froude so dramatically phrased it, "the grass soon grows over blood shed upon the battlefield, but never over blood shed upon the scaffold."

In that very remarkable book, "The Emancipation of Massachusetts," written by a great-grandson of the President who signed the Alien and Sedition bills, Brooks Adams summed up the long struggle for human freedom in these words:

Freedom of thought is the greatest triumph over tyranny that brave men have ever won. For this they fought the wars of the reformation, for this they left their bones to whiten upon unnumbered fields of battle, for this they have gone to the dungeon, the scaffold and the stake. We owe to their heroic devotion the most priceless of our treasures, our perfect liberty of thought and speech.

Five years ago no American would have thought of disputing the truth of that eloquent opinion. Yet if it was true then, it is true now. No fundamental principle of human freedom has been changed as a result of the War. Liberty is still liberty, and it is no less desirable



now than it was the day before Lenin and Trotsky executed the *coup d'état* which made Bolshevism both the Government and the religion of a prostrate Russia.

The capacity for self-government does not depend upon written constitutions or upon Congresses and legislatures or upon armies and policemen. It is something that is inherent in the people themselves. They either have it or they do not have it. It can be developed by education but it cannot be created by fiat of law. The best definition of free institutions of which I have knowledge was made many years ago by Elihu Root in a lecture at Yale University when he said that "Popular government is organized self-control." If we have that organized self-control, we need not be seriously disturbed by the vehemences of soap-box orators and the revolutionary utterances of the preachers of a new political and economic dispensation. If we lack that organized self-control, sedition laws will not save us, nor will governmental restrictions upon the freedom of speech.

There can be no question that the American people have emerged from the clash of arms in a state of perplexity and confusion. The general condition of unrest and discontent is one manifestation of it. The fate of the treaty of peace will serve as an example. Whatever mistakes President Wilson has ever made, the United States under his leadership came out of a victorious war with a power and a prestige that no other nation in all history had ever attained. The American people were not only the dominant political and economic force in the world, but they were the moral masters of civilization, with the opportunity to mould it mightily to their ideals. Having gained this commanding and unique eminence they at once proceeded to abandon it. The President having affronted a powerful element in the Senate, the leadership of the United States in the world was wantonly sacrificed by way of rebuking the President.

We fell to playing school-boy politics with the mightiest international issue ever known to man.

The Senatorial dignity has now been salved, the President has been rebuked, but in the meantime the United States has lost every friend that it ever had and nobody in Europe, Asia, Africa or South America believes in the honesty of our purpose or the integrity of our professions, or trusts us, or is likely soon to trust again.

While we were engaged in destroying our political and moral influence throughout the world, we were likewise engaged in destroying our personal liberty at home, in wrecking the police powers of the States, in nullifying local self-government and in establishing the Federal authority as the supreme arbiter over what men shall eat and what they shall drink, and what the family doctor may prescribe for the influenza. From that to the complete extinguishment of freedom of opinion is only a step; it is a step which all the demagogues of reaction are urging the country to take. Yet in spite even of the blind stupidity and folly of the New York Assembly there are signs that the pendulum is swinging back toward sanity.

We are naturally a conservative people. The form of government established by the Constitution of the United States is now the oldest government in the world. All the others have been revolutionized since Washington first took the oath of office. Of all nations, we are the most reluctant to experiment, and the most resentful of political and economic innovation. If Bolshevism were finally to prevail in the world, we should be the last country to go over to it. We take kindly to any improvised religion, but we are distrustful of everything that tends to disturb business.

It is inevitable that Americans of settled occupation and habit should be startled and terrified whenever a new and radical political idea suddenly shoots across the hori-

zon. They are never quite sure whether it is a meteor or whether it means that the end of the world has come and the heavens are being rolled up like a scroll. Whenever these untoward events begin to disturb the routine of our daily life, there is an immediate demand for the intervention of government. No other people on earth flout government so consistently as we do; no other people are so habitually contemptuous of law; yet no other people have such a superstitious regard for statutes as a bulwark of civilization. The same childlike faith that has made us the chief consumers of patent medicine also leads us to believe that an act of Congress will cure anything.

Yet while these first impulses of the American people are very likely to be wrong, the sober second thought of the American people is almost certain to be right. They often make serious mistakes about men; but in the long run they make few mistakes about measures, and especially about measures that bear a vital relation to the life of the community. When they are confronted with a definite issue which they have had the time and opportunity to discuss in all its aspects they make few blunders at the ballot box.

They have yet to go to the ballot box on any of the questions that are now agitating the nation, but when they do it will be found that their inherent common sense will be a surer security against the excesses of radicalism than all the politicians and professional patriots who are now bedevilling the country. Our liberties today are in far greater danger from the fools and fanatics of reaction than from the fools and fanatics of radicalism.

The War is destined to produce mighty changes, not only politically but economically. Some of these changes have already taken place. Dynasties have been overthrown. Empires have crumbled. New theories of the relation of the individual to property are asserting them-

selves. Civilization is passing through one of its great periods of fermentation or as that splendid soldier-statesman from South Africa, Jan Smuts, visualized it, "the tents have been struck and the great caravan of humanity is once more on the march."

We need not wander blindly into the desert of the unknown and the uncertain. The compass is still true to the pole. The stars have not shifted in their courses. The old landmarks have not been destroyed, and we can still take our direction from them—remembering, if you please, that the people do not belong to the government, but the government belongs to the people—remembering, too, that no problem can be intelligently solved in a representative democracy without the fullest and freest discussion, and that in the end we must rely for our political and economic stability, for the permanence of our institutions—not upon the prosecuting attorney and the jailer, but upon that organized self-control which is both the substance and the soul of popular government.

## CHAPTER XIV

### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

MR. COBB was the strongest and most consistent supporter of the League of Nations in American journalism. While he could not help attacking the Versailles Treaty in some of its unworkable provisions, he saw that the League of Nations provided the means by which impracticable demands based upon the terms of peace could be remedied and peace made real; and that the participation of the United States in the councils of the League would have had a great calming influence. The well-known disinterestedness of the Nation would have had an effect made more forceful still by its power and wealth. That the United States was held out of the League by a political trick to compass a more secure victory for domestic reaction; that the Thirty-one eminent Republicans who stated that the way into closer international relations was to elect a Republican President and Congress were used as bell-wethers to lure good League votes into the service of the tariff Barons; that old European enmities were stirred into a devil's broth of hatred for the same end, and the resumption of international duties and relations bedevilled for years to come to make a victory for place-holders and worse—these things stirred his just wrath, and his wrath did not lack the means of expression.

## THE CORNERSTONE OF PEACE

[September 29, 1918]

It has remained for President Wilson to make the proposed League of Nations the very cornerstone of the peace that ends the World War.

Hitherto the League of Nations has been discussed as one of the collateral issues of the conflict, as something that would eventually have to be realized in relation to a permanent peace, but nevertheless as something that could be postponed, if necessary, until statesmanship had managed to catch up with the enlightened thought of the world.

President Wilson purposes to build peace upon the foundation of the League and make the League of Nations the guarantor of peace. The logic of his argument is irresistible, unless the peoples who have undergone the tragedies and the horrors of this war are determined to bequeath a similar experience to their children or their grandchildren.

The President opposes the formation of a League now because "it would be merely a new alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy." He is opposed to allowing it to remain in abeyance until the work of reconstruction begins, for "it is not likely to be formed after the settlement." It is necessary to guarantee the peace that ends this war, "and peace cannot be guaranteed as an afterthought." Without such an instrument as the League of Nations, "peace will rest in part upon the word of outlaws and only upon that word. For Germany will have to redeem her character not by what happens at the peace table, but by what follows."

If it is true that in time of peace we should prepare for war, it is equally true that in time of war we should

prepare for peace. Unless the statesmanship of Europe is bankrupt, the issue that President Wilson raises must be faced honestly and frankly.

The old system of offensive and defensive alliances proved itself a pitfall for mankind. The world was plunged into the bloodiest war of all history because men deluded themselves into believing that such alliances could keep the peace, and that there was some mysterious efficacy in "the balance of power," which could prevent the competition of armaments from ending in a competition of slaughter. We have learned better by the bitterness and most tragic experience known to history.

There are certain things in relation to this War about which all men are agreed. One is that mankind must be insured against a repetition of that tragedy. This can never be done if the nations at the end of the War are to drift back into the old order in which the assertion of every form of national interest, just or selfish, becomes the main concern of government in foreign affairs, and the preservation of peace is a matter of expediency. It can never be done if the fate of the world is to be left to the bankrupt statesmanship of a single group of nations or to the imperialistic cupidity of some particular alliance.

It is not the statesmen, but the people themselves who have to pay the penalty of this War, and it is obvious that there can be no guarantees against a repetition of this crime against mankind unless the nations turn their back upon the evil systems which produced the War and courageously undertake the establishment of a new order in international affairs.

The War did not come about, as so many excellent folks seem to think, because the Germans were inherently wicked and depraved and the rest of us were inherently pure and virtuous. It was the most logical product of certain international principles which have dominated

Europe for centuries, and which Prussian Imperialism managed to erect into practically a religion. Given the same conditions and the same opportunities and these principles will always produce war, no matter what the nation may be that adopts them or what the original character of the people may be that is obsessed by them.

When the war is over, half of the world will be impoverished. The payment of the war debts alone is a task so great that most of the surplus products of civilization for years will have to be directed to that end. To restore the old competition of armaments is to crush civilization between the upper and lower millstones. To abandon all form of defense is to leave the nation at the mercy of any marauding upstart that manages to grasp the power to make war.

The question of the future is whether the nations are ready to guarantee the peace they make, and enforce it collectively. President Wilson has boldly submitted this issue to the judgment of the world at a time when events compel it to face the facts. Are we to drift back into the old conditions which produced the War, or is the peace itself to be backed and maintained by the united power of all the nations, great and small, that have a stake in international right and justice and liberty?

### SENATE USURPATION

[February 24, 1922]

IN so far as the Constitution of the United States is concerned, the power of the Senate in respect to treaties is essentially the same as the power of the Senate in respect to the appointment of a Postmaster.

The only difference relates to the number of votes required for affirmative action. There is no difference whatever in principle. To ratify a treaty two-thirds of



the Senators present must concur. To confirm the nomination of a Postmaster a majority is sufficient.

The Senate, however, is trying to usurp power in the matter of treaties which it dare not claim in the matter of appointments. It may reject the President's nomination of a Postmaster for no better reason than Senatorial "courtesy," but it does not presume to adopt a reservation changing the name of the appointee. If the President names John Doe, the Senate cannot confirm the nomination with the proviso that the office is to be filled by Richard Roe.

When it deals with treaties, however, it claims this right, and President Harding has inherited a situation similar to that which wrecked the Treaty of Versailles—with his own assistance and co-operation as a Senator.

Mr. Wilson rejected the reservations to the Treaty of Versailles which were produced by the partisan conspiracy organized by Henry Cabot Lodge because, as he said, he could not tell from them whether the Senate had ratified the treaty or rejected it. Mr. Harding would be in the same quandary if the proposed reservations to the treaties framed by the Washington Conference should be adopted by the Senate. Nor could any of the other Governments concerned be sure whether the United States had assumed equal responsibility with them or rejected all responsibility.

In the case of the Treaty of Versailles, the Senators who voted for reservations set up the fiction that the Constitution of the United States had been invaded and that a foreign council could order the United States to send armies to the uttermost parts of the earth to fight in quarrels in which the country had no interest. In the case of the Four-Power Treaty the Brandegee reservation sets up the fiction that the United States is obligated to use force to maintain the rights of Great Britain, Japan and France in their insular possessions in the Pacific.

The controlling impulse in both cases was not solicitude for the Constitution, but a determination to aggrandize the Senate in the conduct of foreign relations. There has been no more eager champion of the theory of the Divine right of the Senate in foreign affairs than Mr. Lodge himself. Nobody ever quite knew what the reservations to the Treaty of Versailles meant, nor can anybody quite know what the proposed reservations to the conference treaties really mean.

There was once a doorkeeper in the House of Representatives who wrote to the folks back home that he was "a bigger man than old Grant." The ambition of the Senate in foreign affairs is to be not only "a bigger man" than the President but to have that fact recognized in every chancellery, to the end that no foreign Government would think it worth while to negotiate a treaty with the United States unless the President had first obtained the august permission of the Senate to participate in such negotiations along lines satisfactory to two-thirds of the Senators.

It is needless to say that if the Senate ever succeeds in establishing this usurpation of power the United States Government can no longer conduct foreign affairs; for treaties must always be matters of adjustment and compromise. They cannot be dictated in advance by a Senate caucus. The right to reject a treaty belongs to the Senate and the right to clarify by interpretation belongs to the Senate, but the right to redraft a treaty or change the meaning, under the pretext of making reservations, never belonged to the Senate and never should belong to the Senate.

Mr. Harding's own record, unfortunately, is bad on this issue, because he joined the Lodge cabal against Mr. Wilson; but Harding the President luckily is not bound by the mistakes of Harding the Senator. He understands the motive back of the Brandegee reservation and the

Johnson reservation, and it is an issue on which he can well afford to appeal to the country for support.

### AS IT WAS IN THE BEGINNING

[March 6, 1919]

FORMER President Taft, at the Metropolitan Opera-House meeting, answered the legal and nationalistic objections that have been advanced against the Constitution of the League of Nations. President Wilson presented the moral and international case for the proposed covenant. Seldom has an issue of such vast importance to the future of mankind been dealt with so adequately by its champions.

When President Wilson, however, said that he was "puzzled by some of the criticisms"—"by the fact of the criticism"—he must have forgotten for the moment that he was a historian before he became a statesman. The criticisms of the Constitution of the League of Nations do not differ in kind from the criticisms of the Constitution of the United States when it was before the States for ratification in 1788.

The Lodges and the Knoxes, the Borahs and the Reeds, the Shermans and the Thomases of that generation were as vociferous, as clamorous and as vehement in antagonizing the Constitution of the United States as are their successors in antagonizing the Constitution of the League of Nations. They conjured up the same fears and the same doubts, the same tyrannies and the same oppressions. Nothing has changed except the name of the instrument that is assailed.

The Constitution of 1787 was a thing of terror to thousands of honest and well-meaning Americans. Its very preamble was a revolution, according to Patrick

Henry, who demanded to know by what right the Convention spoke "the language of 'We, the people,' instead of 'We, the States.' " "It is an aristocracy and was intended to be so by the framers of it," he said.

Senator Lodge is not more insistent today about the paramount duty of the Peace Conference to confine itself to the bare question of terms to Germany than Patrick Henry was in regard to the fundamental mistake of the Convention of 1787. As he declared to the Virginia Convention:

The Federal Convention ought to have amended the old system; for this purpose they were solely delegated; the object of their mission extended to no other consideration.

When Philander C. Knox of Pennsylvania complains about the language of the Constitution of the League of Nations, we are reminded of another Knox who told the Massachusetts delegates that Boston would have liked the Constitution of the United States much better "had it been higher toned."

On April 21, 1788, some of the delegates to the Maryland Convention, headed by Luther Martin, issued an "Address to the People of Maryland," in which they said:

We consider the proposed form of national government as very defective, and that the liberty and happiness will be endangered if the system be not greatly changed and altered.

Said James Lincoln to the South Carolina Convention:

What have you been contending for in the ten years past? Liberty! What is liberty? The power of governing yourselves. If you adopt this Constitution have you this power? No; you give it in the hands of men who live 1,000 miles distant from you. Let the people but once trust their liberties out of their own hands and what will be the consequence? First, a haughty, imperious aristocracy, and ultimately a tyrannical monarchy.

Senator Reed is not more terrified by the nations of Europe than Singletary of Massachusetts was by the character of the men who favored the Constitution of the United States. This is the picture of them that he presented to the Massachusetts Convention:

These lawyers and men of learning and moneyed men that talk so finely and gloss over matters so smoothly to make us poor, illiterate people swallow down the pill expect to get into Congress themselves; they expect to be managers of this Constitution and get all the power and all the money into their own hands, and then they will swallow up all us little folks, Mr. President; yes, just as the whale swallowed up Jonah.

Senator Borah's notion that he would not support a League of Nations if requested to by "the Saviour of Mankind" is that of a delegate to the Massachusetts Convention described by Elliott as "the Hon. Mr. White," who said that—

We ought to be jealous of rulers. All the godly men we read of had failed; nay, he would not trust "a flock of Moseses."

Nor was President Wilson a whit more 'disloyal to the American people in the opinion of Senator Poindexter than were Washington and Franklin and Hamilton and Madison in the opinion of Tredwell of New York:

In this Constitution, sir, we have departed widely from the principles and political faith of '76, when the spirit of liberty ran high and danger put a curb on ambition. Here we find no security for the right of individuals, no security for the existence of our State Governments. \* \* \* Sir, in this Constitution we have not only neglected—we have done worse—we have openly violated our faith—that is, our public faith.

Is there a solitary Senator who is more cocksure as to the unconstitutionality of the League of Nations than

Gen. Thompson of Massachusetts was in regard to the unconstitutionality of the Constitution itself? Compare the Senate speeches with this:

The Convention were sent on to Philadelphia to amend this Confederation, but they made a new creature; and the very setting out of it is unconstitutional.

And what did Smith tell the New York Convention about that noble and august institution, the Senate of the United States?—

Can the liberties of 3,000,000 people be securely trusted in the hands of twenty-four men? Is it prudent to commit to so small a number the decision of the great questions which shall come before them? Reason revolts at the idea.

Yet we have managed to survive even a Senate of ninety-six men. But Smith of New York was an optimist as compared with Rawlins Lowndes of South Carolina, who confided these opinions to the Convention of his State:

On the whole, this was the best preparatory plan for a monarchical government he had read. The Constitution of Great Britain he considered the best monarchical one he had ever perused; and this new Government came so near to it that, as our changing from a republic to a monarchy, it was what everybody must naturally expect. How easy the transition! No difficulty occurred in finding a King; the President was the man proper for this appointment. The Senate hailing him as a King (constituted according to Mr. Adams's description from the well-born) will naturally say to one another: "You see how we are situated. Certainly it is for our country's benefit that we should all be lords," and lords they are!

George Mason pointed out to the Virginia Convention how the Constitution must inevitably destroy the country:

Will the people of this great country submit to be individually taxed by two different and distinct powers? Will

they suffer themselves to be doubly harassed? These two concurrent powers cannot exist long together; the one will destroy the other. \* \* \* Is it to be supposed that one national government will suit so extensive a country, embracing so many climates and containing inhabitants so very different in manners, habits and customs? It is ascertained by history that there never was a very extensive country without destroying the liberties of the people.

How reminiscent of the recent debates in the Senate on the League of Nations!

Senator Lodge's opinion of the Executive Council of the League of Nations seems to have originated with Mr. Jones of Bristol, who confided to the Massachusetts Convention that—

By this power to regulate elections Congress might keep themselves in to all duration.

Major Kingsley had similar fears, for he told the Massachusetts Convention that—

Congress may equally oppress the people because we cannot call them to account, considering that there is no annual election, no rotation, no power to recall them provided for.

As for the ultimate fate of the American people, this is how it was visualized by Mr. Symmes of Massachusetts:

For, sir, I also disapprove of the power to collect which is here vested in Congress. It is a power, sir, to burden us with a standing army of ravenous collectors—harpies, perhaps, from another State, but who, however, were never known to have bowels for any purpose but to fatten on the life-blood of the people. In an age or two, and when the Congress shall become tyrannical, these vultures, their servants, will be the tyrants of the village by whose presence all freedom of speech and action will be taken away.

The record might run on indefinitely; but how consistent with the Senate objection to the Constitution of

the League of Nations was Mason's objection to the Constitution of the United States to the Massachusetts delegates!—

We are under oath; we have sworn that Massachusetts is a sovereign and independent State. How, then, can we vote for this Constitution that destroys that sovereignty?

And yet, as for Massachusetts, in the language of Daniel Webster, "there she is"—still standing after 130 years of ruthless tyranny under the Constitution of the United States and reasonably happy in her servitude.

To the last-ditch Senators who have determined that in no circumstances will they submit to a League of Nations we can commend the final defiance of Patrick Henry to the Virginia Convention:

Is this tame relinquishment of rights worthy of freemen? Is it worthy of that manly fortitude that ought to characterize republicans? It is said that eight States have accepted this plan. I declare that if twelve and a half had adopted it, I would, with manly fortitude, and in spite of an erring world, reject it.

Many difficulties have arisen under the Constitution of the United States and many adjustments have been necessary, but, the particular difficulties and dangers that the critics of the Constitution foresaw have never been realized. History has made them ridiculous, as it is in the habit of doing with men who try to be wiser than events.

The opponents of a League of Nations are now engaged in painting ghastly pictures of the downfall of the Republic should the United States enter into a compact with other self-governing nations to make a temporary peace permanent. They are probably just as earnest and just as wise as the doubters and the croakers of 1788. Modern civilization is a record of political progress, and



political progress belongs to the men who look forward, not to the men who look backward—to the men who take counsel of courage, not to the men who take counsel of cowardice.

### LODGE VERSUS LODGE

[March 21, 1919]

PRESIDENT LOWELL of Harvard, in the course of the joint debate with Senator Lodge in Boston on the League of Nations, submitted the following questions to the Senator:

As the senior United States Senator from this State, as the leader of our party in the Senate, we have the right to ask you, Senator Lodge—first, whether you will or will not vote for the covenant of Paris, provided it is amended as you wish; what amendments do you want, and why do you not submit them?

Senator Lodge made no direct answer to any of these questions. In regard to the first, he expressed the pious hope that "we shall have a league in proper form," but "in my belief it will be done somewhere and not in Paris," the only place in which there is any possibility of its being done.

In respect to the second and third questions, Senator Lodge, as the author of the Round Robin, insisted that "I happen to be a Senator of the United States. I cannot speak with the authority of the Senate. The Senate, under the Constitution, has the right to advise and consent."

Then the Senator proceeded to attack President Wilson for the manner in which the negotiations have been conducted, and said:

If the President of the United States had done what other Presidents have done, if he had laid that before the Senate—

I am only asking something that has been done by almost all our Presidents, who have consulted the Senate about entering into negotiations, about the character of the negotiations, about awards, about pending negotiations.

Pretending that Jackson, that Grant, that Washington, that Lincoln had done this, although he carefully refrained from citing a single instance, Senator Lodge continued:

If the President had laid that draft before the Senate, as these other Presidents have done, if he had said to the Senate, "I submit this draft to you for your advice, I hope for your approval and for such suggestions as you may have to make," he would have had the amendments laid before him to present to the Peace Conference in Paris. The battle would have been more than half won by the mere submission.

He not only did not lay it before us, before the constitutional body which is entitled to advise him, but he does not call the Senate together now to advise him.

Senator Lodge's grievance, then, is not so much against the League of Nations as against the conduct of President Wilson in refusing to consult the Senate in advance as to the provisions of the Constitution and the terms of the treaty of peace.

Whether that is a valid grievance or not we shall leave to Senator Lodge himself to decide. A similar question arose in the Senate in January, 1906, in regard to President Roosevelt's action in relation to the Algeciras Conference and the Santo Domingo affair. This is what Senator Lodge, speaking on the floor of the Senate Chamber, said on Jan. 24, 1906, in regard to the respective powers of the President and the Senate in the matter of treaties (*Congressional Record*, page 1470):

No one, I think, can doubt the absolute power of the President to initiate and carry on all negotiations; and after a treaty has been returned to him with the ratification of the Senate, to withhold it from ratification if he sees fit so to

do. There is no doubt that the Senate can by resolution advise the President to enter upon a negotiation, or advise the President to refrain from a negotiation; but those resolutions have no binding force whatsoever, and the action of the Senate becomes operative and actually effective only when a treaty is actually submitted to it. *We have no possible right to break suddenly into the middle of a negotiation and demand from the President what instructions he has given to his representative.*

Furthermore, in the course of that speech Senator Lodge gave his unqualified approval to the remarks of Senator Spooner the day before, in the course of which that great constitutional lawyer had thus defined the President's powers:

From the foundation of the Government it has been conceded in practice and in theory that the Constitution vests the power of negotiation and the various phases—and they are multifarious—of the conduct of our foreign relations exclusively in the President. He does not exercise that constitutional power, nor can he be made to do it, under the tutelage or guardianship of the Senate or of the House, or of the Senate and House combined. \* \* \*

When he shall have negotiated and sent his proposed treaty to the Senate the jurisdiction of that body attaches and its powers begin. It may advise and consent or it may refuse. And in the exercise of this function it is as independent of the Executive as he is independent of it in the matter of negotiation.

And Henry Cabot Lodge, in unqualifiedly indorsing Senator Spooner's speech, said: "I quite realize that after the manner in which he has dealt with those questions, anything that I may say is in great danger of being an anti-climax."

Judging Senator Lodge from his speech in Boston Wednesday night and from his speech in the Senate Jan. 24, 1906, what are we to assume? That there is one Constitution for Republican Presidents and quite a dif-

ferent Constitution for Democratic Presidents? That Republican Presidents have complete constitutional power to originate and negotiate treaties independently of the Senate, but that Democratic Presidents must first consult the Senate and ask permission to negotiate?

We are reluctant to think that Senator Lodge is playing partisan politics with this grave issue of the League of Nations—that he is more concerned about 'discrediting' President Wilson than he is about helping to guarantee the peace of the world and prevent a repetition of this terrible war. But what conclusion are we to form from his speech of Jan. 24, 1906, and his speech of March 19, 1919? How can they be reconciled? What is the mystery of this extraordinary case of Lodge *versus* Lodge?

### ONLY ITS DEBTS AND ITS DEAD

[October 9, 1920]

AN immediate response to Senator Harding's Des Moines speech comes from Herbert Parsons, former Republican Representative in Congress, former Chairman of the Republican County Committee and former member of the Republican National Committee from New York. Senator Harding has repudiated the League of Nations, and Mr. Parsons has repudiated Senator Harding. He will vote for Gov. Cox.

Mr. Parsons has done what every Republican ought to do who professes to believe in the League of Nations as a matter of conviction and high principle. There can be no honor in politics, there can be no integrity in politics, when men substitute partisanship for conscience and blindly vote for candidates to whose policies and programme they are opposed. It took courage to do what

Mr. Parsons has done, but if government in the United States is to have character and principle, such courage has become imperative.

It is not the League of Nations alone that Senator Harding has scrapped. He has scrapped the treaty of peace as well. He has scrapped the American Army in the occupied zone of Germany. So far as possible he has scrapped the War and the victory bought with American blood and treasure. He has scrapped the honor of the United States.

His speech at Des Moines was more than an admission that he favored the outright rejection of the League. He said further that American troops "haven't any business" in Germany to help guarantee the provisions of the Armistice that American troops helped to win. He turned his back on all the nations associated with the United States in war, and pledged himself to declare the War at an end without even the formality of a treaty arrangement with the German Government. America is simply to scuttle, to run away, to hide.

Lest we be accused of misinterpreting the Republican candidate's position, we quote his exact words, with the further explanation that they are taken from the report of his speech in the *New York Tribune*:

"It is not necessary to make a separate treaty with Germany, though those with whom we were in war have already done so. As a matter of fact, this was what I said: That just as soon as Congress would pass a resolution declaring a state of formal peace in the United States I would sign it. There is formal peace, isn't there? Do you know whether or not you are at war? Well, so long as we are at peace why not say so?"

Senator Harding referred to the list of questions in his hand. Then he said, "Another question was asked"—

A man in the first gallery interrupted, asking: "How about the boys who are over in Germany yet?"

"Repeat your question, please," requested the candidate.

The man did so, even to the "yet."

"I want to allude to that," said the Senator. "They haven't any business there, and just as soon as we declare formal peace we can be sure they will be coming home as they ought to come."

Surrender has never been more abject. Although Senator Harding continues to proclaim that "we did not go into this last war pursuing some fatuous ideal," he is not content even to sacrifice the ideals of the American people. Everything else is to be sacrificed to a paper peace that can have no status in international law and that will in the end compel the United States to sue for terms from Germany.

This is the price the Republican candidate is ready to pay for the hyphenated vote. The party that once boasted that it was the party of Americanism and great moral ideals is now committed to the proposition that the United States is to have nothing to show for the War except its debts and its dead.

### ARMISTICE DAY

[November 11, 1920]

Two years ago today the world was celebrating the signing of the Armistice—the end of the War—the coming of a peace that would justify sacrifices that staggered the human imagination. Today the world is looking toward the future doubtfully and apprehensively, wondering if the peace that was won at so terrible a price will ever be stabilized or attained.

So far as the United States is concerned, it is still in a state of war with Germany. In the nineteen months and five days that elapsed from April 6, 1917, to Nov. 11, 1918, this country raised and equipped an army of more than 4,000,000 men, transported 2,000,000 troops

to France and by the sheer weight of its military and economic power brought the War to an end. In the twenty-four months that have elapsed since the signing of the Armistice we have been unable even to ratify a treaty of peace that all the other belligerents long ago accepted.

We have contributed nothing to the reconstruction of civilization except doubt and turmoil and suspicion. We alone have intruded party politics into the treaty of peace. We alone have refused to recognize any responsibilities or obligations arising from a victorious war. We alone have broken faith with the dead.

By common consent, the French, who were magnificent in adversity, have proved themselves anything but magnificent in success, but the growing ascendancy of the French military and reactionary elements would never have come about if the United States Senate had not played Republican politics with the treaty of peace and defeated ratification. That unique offense has strengthened the hand of imperialism everywhere, not only in France but in Great Britain, Italy and Japan, while in Germany the Junker forces now regard the certainty of a separate peace with the United States as the longest single step toward the ultimate overthrow of the Treaty of Versailles.

Much has been said both here and in Europe about President Wilson's mistakes, but most of the indictments of the President reduce themselves on analysis to two counts—namely, that he was an honest man who wanted a peace that was right and just, and who believed that the American people would remain true to the ideals which they professed when they entered the War. Those are the President's offenses.

The politicians who controlled the Allied Governments did not want a peace of justice. They wanted a peace of plunder. Germany was down, Central Europe was destroyed, and their one thought was not of the

future but of the loot of victory. At home the Republican Senators wanted no peace at all with which the name of Woodrow Wilson was identified. No matter what the terms of the Treaty of Versailles might have been, they would have fought any other treaty as bitterly and as viciously as they fought the treaty that was submitted to them for ratification sixteen months ago.

The dead and the living alike have been defrauded in the two years that have passed since the Armistice was signed. The war that was fought to end war turns out to have been a war in which one kind of imperialism has been triumphant over another kind of imperialism. The peace of the world is still precarious because Government has failed in its supreme obligation, and the record of no other Government is so shameful or so inexcusable as that of the United States, represented in a Senate drunk with the raw alcohol of a poisonous partisanship.

Two years ago the United States occupied a place of prestige and influence in the affairs of the world such as no other nation had ever attained. We have nothing whatever to show for it now. Our financial and economic power is feared, because nobody knows how we may use it; but otherwise we are distrusted and hated, and are without a real friend in the world. Two years after the Armistice, that is what we have to show for our sacrifices.

### DEMOCRACY IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

[August 14, 1921]

VISCOUNT BRYCE, in his criticisms of the Treaty of Versailles in his lectures at the Institute of Politics, seems to have generally disregarded the one dominant fact that should not have escaped the inquiring attention of the author of *Modern Democracies*.



The mistakes of the Versailles Treaty are not so much the mistakes of statesmen as the mistakes of public opinion. This was the first great treaty of peace that was ever framed under democratic auspices. No statesman at that conference was in any sense a free agent, and by the irony of fate the one who was nearest a free agent was repudiated by the other branch of the national treaty-making power when he returned from Paris.

What Gen. Smuts has said of the Treaty seems much nearer to the philosophical truth than what Viscount Bryce has said:

It was not the statesmen who failed so much as the spirit of the peoples behind them. The hope, the aspiration, for a new world order of peace and right and justice, however deeply and universally felt, was still only feeble and ineffective in comparison with the dominant national passions which found their expression in the peace treaty.

The failures of the Treaty of Versailles are in their widest sense the failures of democracy working for the first time in the field of international affairs in the midst of the most stupendous crisis that civilization has ever known. The noble and altruistic sentiments which were bred of the terrible sacrifices of the War did not long survive the Armistice, and they were succeeded by an aggressive nationalism which cared for nothing except itself and its own immediate material interests.

The vital lesson of the Treaty of Versailles has been little emphasized at Williamstown. It is this: If democracy is to remain supreme in the realm of foreign relations, it must demonstrate both an intelligence and a self-control that it has not yet shown in international affairs. What marred the Treaty of Versailles can easily wreck the disarmament conference in Washington. A public opinion that is directed solely toward its own nationalistic interests is certain to be more of a menace to the peace of the world than the old diplomacy, which,

however corrupt, was at least informed and had learned the meaning of the Bismarckian motto, "*Do ut des*"—I give that you may give.

Democracy has assumed dominion over diplomacy, and rightly so; but it must justify itself or pay the penalty for its follies. Wars are seldom made by peoples; they are usually made by politicians engaged in capitalizing rivalries and jealousies. But every people is responsible for its politicians; it creates them and gives to them their power for evil as well as their power for good.

The fate of the disarmament conference will accordingly depend less on the men who compose that conference, important as it is that the right kind of men be selected, than on the kind and character of the public opinion that is behind them. Being creatures of it, they are certain to follow it, and if it is not sincere no sincerity can be expected from them. The nations can rid themselves of their bankrupting burden of competitive armament if they choose, but they cannot do it by making the hysterical nationalistic demands upon their statesmen which they made at Versailles.

### DECORATED BUT DESERTED

[October 18, 1921]

IN the midst of impressive ceremonies Gen. John J. Pershing yesterday laid the Congressional Medal of Honor on the grave of the unknown British soldier who lies buried in Westminster Abbey.

The same Congress, however, which so ostentatiously bestowed its Medal of Honor has with equal ostentation abandoned the cause for which that unknown soldier died. The United States Senate is now preparing to vote for the ratification of a separate treaty of peace with Ger-

many which seeks to reduce the War to the status of a damage suit and to limit the aims and objects of the United States to the collection of certain money claims against the democratic successor of the Imperial German Government.

It is humanly impossible to reconcile the ceremony that took place yesterday in Westminster Abbey with the treaty that the Republican Senators are waiting to vote on as soon as the Senator that the Governor of Pennsylvania has appointed as successor to the late Philander C. Knox takes the oath of office. It is likewise humanly impossible to reconcile the Treaty with any cause for which men have voluntarily died since the record of history began. War is an ancient institution and nations have fought for various ends, but no nation ever before proclaimed in the form of a treaty that its dominant motive in making peace was to avoid all the obligations and responsibilities that it had incurred in making war.

When Congress voted its Medal of Honor to Great Britain's unknown soldier it was acting in the utmost sincerity. It was expressing an emotion that lies deep in the heart of most Americans and to which Mr. Wilson sought to give expression in the Treaty of Versailles. The treaty that is now before the Senate does not give expression to any sentiment that was ever harbored in the heart of man. Except for the political predicament in which the Administration found itself by reason of a political raid against the Treaty of Versailles and the subsequent adoption of the Knox-Porter resolution, it would never occur to the mind of anybody to negotiate such a treaty as that which Mr. Harding had submitted.

It is not a treaty of peace in any sense in which treaties of peace have hitherto been understood. In so far as it makes peace with Germany it is an incoherent and unintelligible peace, subject always to such modifications as the Allies may make in the Treaty of Versailles

to which this country has refused to become a party. It is rather a treaty of peace between the warring factions of the Republican Senators who had nothing in common except their hatred of Mr. Wilson and are still held together in foreign affairs only by that hatred.

What makes the situation still more incomprehensible, the hope of ratification does not lie with Republican Senators but with the two Democratic leaders, Mr. Underwood and Mr. Hitchcock, who are expected to furnish the votes that are needed to give the necessary two-thirds. In doing this they will have turned their backs on the record of their party, they will have repudiated the leadership under which the War was won, they will have abandoned every principle which they championed while the issue was in the balance and will have clinched the kind of peace which they once passionately denounced.

It is fitting that the Congressional Medal of Honor should lie on the grave of the unknown British soldier who is sleeping his last sleep within the historic walls of Westminster Abbey; but if this German Treaty is to be ratified in the form in which it has been submitted to the United States Senate, the medal is not complete in itself. It should bear the inscription, "Decorated but Deserted."

### THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT

[Speech at the National Republican Club,  
January 7, 1922]

NEARLY a year ago I was privileged to assist in opening the Republican Club's discussion of the limitation of armament. At that time I predicted that after you gentlemen had finished paying your income taxes your interest in the question would be much more acute than it was then. The fact that you are having another armament meeting

this year is proof that the prediction was not wide of the mark.

Such meetings as that held by the Republican Club last year had much to do with facilitating the expression of public opinion which brought about the Conference for the Limitation of Armament now in session in Washington. The work of that Conference I shall not discuss, except in its general application to problems that remain to be solved. You have here a distinguished United States Senator and a distinguished Republican representative both of whom will deal in an official way with the treaties, and what they have to say to you is far more important than anything I can say.

In discussing the results of the Conference, much depends in the point of view—whether we regard it as a beginning or an end. If an end, public expectation will undoubtedly be disappointed. If a beginning, its constructive value can hardly be over-estimated. What I am going to urge on you today is to regard it as a beginning, and to appeal to you to exert all your influence to carry it forward.

I do not profess to know what the election of 1920 meant, except that the country seemed to be rather tired of us deserving Democrats. If some of you insist that it meant a foreign policy of isolation, I must remind you that there are certain questions that cannot be disposed of summarily by a plebiscite. A little more than twenty-five years ago, a political party with which I am intermittently identified, undertook to proclaim the financial isolation of the United States. It declared that the fiat of government should make sixteen ounces of silver equal in value to one ounce of gold. A change of 25,000 votes properly distributed would have made Mr. Bryan President of the United States—but it would not have made sixteen ounces of silver equal in value to one ounce of gold. Even the fiat of government is not omnipotent,

nor can a popular plurality of 7,000,000 turn the hands of the clock back to the conditions that produced Washington's Farewell Address. The moving finger has written and moved on since 1796.

Take down your atlas and look at the map of the Eastern Hemisphere. From the Rhine on the north and the Nile on the south, sweeping eastward to the Pacific Ocean, there is nothing, except in a few tiny cases, that remotely resembles political and economic stability. Within that vast territory of fermentation is contained fully three-fourths of the population of the entire world, and every one of you is affected in a greater or less degree by what is going on there. Because a billion and a quarter of people are living in a state of political and economic turmoil, Western farmers are burning corn for fuel and clamoring for legislation that will enable them to pay the interest on the mortgage. Because of it industrial wars are in progress in almost every State, labor striking against wage reductions that mean a lower standard of living, and employers resisting wage scales that mean bankruptcy. It is a conflict in which it is possible to sympathize with both sides; for both are victims of circumstances over which they have no control.

How ridiculous then to talk about isolation! How vain to pretend that it does not concern us! You might as well talk about isolation when your neighbor's house is in flames. If you want the United States to be isolated, you will first have to abolish modern industry, which can exist only on international trade, which in turn can survive only under international political conditions that promote credit and confidence.

There has come out of the Washington Conference a Four-Power Treaty which extends over all the islands of the Pacific substantially the guaranties provided for in Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Some of the "best minds" forgot to tell the President of

the United States just what the treaty meant, and the immediate consequences were deplorable, to say the least, but nevertheless, it is a good treaty. If nothing else has been suppressed it is an excellent treaty, and the United States assumes the obligation in the Pacific that it ought to assume. It is interesting to record the fact that while there has been a good deal of grumbling about the nature of this agreement, the Constitution still survives, and the heavens have not rolled up like a scroll.

The next step is to recognize in respect to Europe the same obligations and the same responsibilities that we are recognizing toward the Islands of the Pacific. There is no other way out of our own accumulating difficulties, and if we delay too long, we may discover that every exit is barred. What seems to me the soundest and wisest and most practical American foreign policy could be written in a single sentence, which is this: "Anything that happens, no matter where, or how, which menaces the peace of the world, or the economic stability of the world, concerns the United States." That is not the doctrine of a shoddy pinchbeck imperialism. It is a doctrine for a strong, powerful, self-contained nation that is seeking no special advantages for itself, and is not afraid to play the part that belongs to it. In its practical application it would make the United States the greatest and most helpful mediating influence in civilization.

No nation ever saved itself by running to cover. No nation ever will. The notion that we alone are pure and holy and unselfish and that all other peoples are crooked and greedy and treacherous has nothing to sustain it except a certain Puritan self-righteousness. Other peoples are much like ourselves, but special problems and special difficulties have given them different points of view that we do not always share—often that we cannot comprehend unless we set ourselves seriously to the task of comprehension.

Nothing in relation to the Washington Conference is more enlightening than the vast amount of international understanding that has resulted from governments sitting around the council table, and freely discussing their problems.

There have been sharp clashes of opinion and interest; but even here the situation is made better and safer because these differences have been brought into the open and submitted to the public opinion of three continents.

Regardless of 7,000,000 plurality I believe in the League of Nations. I believe in all similar agencies of international conciliation and adjustment. We can never know how they will work until we have tried them, and the time to criticize them is when they have failed, not before they have had a chance to succeed. The true place of the United States is at the council table of the Nations whenever an issue arises that concerns the welfare of the Nations—honest, straightforward and shirking no responsibility. That to me is the most impressive demonstration of the Washington Conference. I submit it to you for your consideration regardless of any question of partisanship.

### LORD ROBERT CECIL'S MISSION

[April 3, 1923]

No other man can discuss the League of Nations more authoritatively than Lord Robert Cecil. He believed in it long before it came into existence. He helped to establish it. The covenant is in no small part the work of his brain and his hand, and he is speaking to the American people as the representative of the Union of South Africa in the Assembly of the League. He owes this appointment not to a British Prime Minister or to



a British Foreign Secretary but to that eminent liberal Jan Smuts.

The League of Nations that Lord Robert Cecil has come to the United States to discuss is the real League of Nations. It bears no relation to the fantastic and almost wholly mythical League of the Senate debate on the Treaty of Versailles, which was a creation of partisan passion and personal prejudice. The League that he is talking about is the League that exists, the League that is slowly finding itself and exerting its gradually acquired influence to help stabilize the crumbling peace of the world.

Lord Robert has not come to the United States on a mission of propaganda. He is not appealing to the American people to join the League. Rather, he is trying to explain the League to them and also to explain to them the condition of the white man's civilization as he has come to see it.

The message that he brings is a message that the American people cannot ignore, for events day by day are shrieking it into their ears. In 1920 a vast majority of them still believed in what was regarded as the historical policy of isolation. This isolation, to be sure, was largely fictitious, as they might have known from their own experience, but, disillusioned by the war, they swung to the furthest extreme of foreign policy in the determination to have nothing more to do with Europe.

The result of that temporary decision has been anything but satisfactory, and the ranks of the uncompromising isolationists have steadily dwindled since the election of 1920. Mr. Harding began with a determination to have nothing to do with the League. As Ambassador Harvey expressed it after many consultations with the President, "Our present Government could not without betrayal of its creators and masters, and will not, I assure

you, have anything whatsoever to do with the League or with any commission or committee appointed by it or responsible to it directly or indirectly, openly or furtively."

Mr. Harding is now staking his foreign policy and his candidacy for renomination on American adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was established under the covenant of the League and the Judges of which are appointed by the League.

Mr. Hughes inaugurated his career as Secretary of State by refusing to answer the League's communications to the State Department, and Mr. Hughes is now working with four of the League's commissions without exciting the Olympian wrath of the United States Senate.

There is still an aggressive faction of irreconcilables in the Republican party which is ready to die in the last ditch rather than permit this Government to join in the Permanent Court of International Justice. There is still a Democratic faction which believes that it is better to conciliate the hyphenated vote than to discharge the great responsibilities of the United States to modern civilization. But in both parties the advocates of outright isolation decline steadily in numbers and in influence, however slow the progress may be in the direction of meeting American obligations.

The League of Nations has survived without the support of the United States. In its most critical period it survived open and active American hostility, and it lives not because this man or that man has championed it but because it is meeting a vital need in the affairs of nations.

It is this League—the actual, living League—that Lord Robert Cecil has come to the United States to interpret. What he has to say deserves most earnest and most thoughtful consideration by the American people. Foreign policy is too important to be made forever the football of partisanship and of passion. Soon or late all the

facts must be faced, and nobody is better qualified to discuss the facts of the League of Nations than Lord Robert Cecil, who has given some of the best years of his life to the great task of finding means by which the peace of the world can be established and secured.

## CHAPTER XV

### THE LAST ARTICLE

THE last article that came from the pen of Mr. Cobb —came, rather, from the battered typewriter that he had impetuously pounded when in better case—was printed in *The World*, July 19, 1923. For a few days thereafter some member of the staff would call at his home each morning and bring to the office notes from which an article would be written. Soon it was ordered that these attempts to continue work should cease, but the sudden and unexpected death of Mr. Harding and the accession of President Coolidge caused the breaking of the rule for the last time. Sincere and kindly as he always wished to be, Mr. Cobb chose his words with great care, speaking so slowly that the article as it appeared, a greeting to a new President by one who had studied the official acts of all his predecessors, is practically in his own carefully weighed phrases.

#### PRESIDENT COOLIDGE

[August 4, 1923]

THERE is no more difficult undertaking in politics than that of a Vice-President suddenly promoted by the death of a President. Vice-Presidents are always out of the sphere of administrative action. Washington little heeds them as makers of policy, and not at all as announcers of

national decisions. Even though Mr. Harding made Mr. Coolidge a member of the Cabinet, in a well-meant endeavor to further intercourse and understanding with Congress, the experiment bore no visible fruits of success. In his public addresses since he went to Washington, Mr. Coolidge has refrained from any allusion to controverted matters, in dealing with which he could take no part.

Now he comes to the most conspicuous executive office known to political life, facing a disorganized party and a Nation in disquietude. Theodore Roosevelt, succeeding to William McKinley as President, fell heir to an almost perfect party machine, which never failed in his time to function. Today Republican leadership is bankrupt, rent by faction, oppressed by mutterings of revolt. The Best-Mind theory is a myth. The party needs, the country will welcome, a strong hand.

The circumstances present a great opportunity. President Coolidge has a blank sheet upon which to write history. Vice-Presidents are never nominated with the idea of their elevation to the higher post, and the country really knows little about its new Executive except that his firmness in handling the Boston police strike, as Governor of Massachusetts, left a favorable impression of his force of character. He will have the sympathy and the support of the American people, without regard to party ties. Such political obstruction as he may meet will come less from Democracy than from Republican faction, but for the moment even faction is a feeble thing. The big factor in his situation is the patriotic devotion of a united people wishing him godspeed in his great trust.

## CHAPTER XVI

### THE WORLD'S TRIBUTE

FRANK I. COBB

[Editorial in *The World*, December 22, 1923]

FRANCIS IRVING COBB died at what should have been the midway mark of his strong, busy, useful life. But fifty-four years of age, he had won a secure place among the leading editors of his time. He had stepped across the threshold of greatness.

No man ever wore his honors more modestly. In the cause of great principles which he held dear he lavished his rugged strength, his capacity for concentration and his native gift of biting phrase until the fatal illness, beginning last spring in a swift decline, struck the pen from his hand. For self-exploitation he had no time or strength or desire. The anonymity of editorial writing gave him power for a purpose, and that purpose was the public good.

Mr. Cobb was an independent in everything. In politics he usually found the Democratic party more nearly headed in his direction, but he never failed to note and mark its errors and shortcomings. First of all, he was concerned with the defense, the orderly development and the extension of human freedom, social, intellectual, industrial and political. His foe was the standpatter; the sin he loathed was reaction; the goal he sought for all

men was wider knowledge and the liberty to use that knowledge in free self-expression.

Mr. Cobb was a born editor. He fitted the modern conditions of his craft, with its new demands for conciseness and the careful economy of space which the hurry of American readers compels. He did not waste words; he could swing the bludgeon or wield the rapier at will; and he possessed the gift, which some great editorial writers have lacked, of revising and improving the work of other men, to whom daily association with him was a privilege and an inspiration.

Like every public man of his time Mr. Cobb was tried in the fiery furnace of the war. With all its marvel of invention and prodigality of blood and treasure it developed nothing new in the spirit of man. The problems it posed and largely failed to solve were the old problems. Mr. Cobb denounced from the first the imperialism run mad which sought "world power or downfall" for Berlin as a holding company ruling vast areas and subject races. He strongly supported the American cause in the War; as strongly, since the War, he pleaded for justice and generosity to a beaten foe.

As editor of *The World*, Mr. Cobb taught scorn of narrowness in American intellectual and political life. He saw and ceased not to stress the need of American participation, as a means of introducing sanity and disinterestedness, in the post-war welter of Europe. He scourged the tithing-men at home who would have put the intellectual life of the New World into the stocks. His grasp of American political history was as extraordinary in its minuteness as it was in breadth. He was a vigilant champion of liberalism.

Something is said elsewhere in this issue of *The World*, by many men in and out of the office, of what the kindly, gentle, generous man who has passed behind the

veil meant to those who knew him intimately. Here *The World* pays its tribute to Frank Cobb as a leader of thought and an inspirer of action in the wider field of the Nation. In him it has lost one of its noblest sons.

THE END







































UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



140 268

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY